



DOCUMENTS DEPARTMENT

5/S

MAIN LIBRARY



F

A

663270

NOT TO BE TAKEN FROM THE LIBRARY

FORM 3427 5000 9-51

SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC LIBRARY



3 1223 90204 4768





Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2014



REPORT OF  
THE CITIZENS' POSTWAR PLANNING COMMITTEE  
TO  
MAYOR ROGER D. LAPHAM

This report, like the United Nations Charter, was created out of honest differences of opinion and conceived in the spirit of compromise.

Quibbling over details can split our united front and defeat our great objective which is to build a metropolis worthy of its glorious traditions and well equipped to meet its challenging future.



CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO  
CITIZENS' POSTWAR PLANNING COMMITTEE

August 20, 1945

Honorable Roger D. Lapham  
Mayor  
Room 200, City Hall  
San Francisco 2, California

Dear Mr. Mayor:

The Citizens' Postwar Planning Committee, appointed by you on April 5, 1945, pursuant to Resolution Number 4229 of the Board of Supervisors, herewith submits its report and findings on postwar municipal construction projects. The report has the approval of the entire Committee, qualified by the specific exceptions made by Messrs. MacPhee, Nasser, Phillips and Uhl, attached to the report.

The Committee met and organized on April 13, 1945. The following procedure was adopted:

1. The Committee reviewed the six-year program submitted to the Mayor by the San Francisco City Planning Commission and discussed it with representatives of that Commission and of the other City Departments concerned.

2. It gave public notice that all other projects recommended by municipal departments and those advocated by civic organizations or individual citizens would be considered at the completion of the review of the City Planning Commission's six-year program. Special meetings were devoted to these hearings.

3. The Committee held a series of executive sessions at the close of the public meetings in order that the members could discuss frankly all aspects of the plans submitted before arriving at the final decisions to be embodied in its report.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO  
LIBRARY  
540 EAST 57TH STREET  
CHICAGO, ILL. 60637

1992-1993

The Committee is composed of fourteen members, signatory to this report. The fifteenth member resigned because of inability to attend meetings. There are twelve alternates whose names are listed at the conclusion of this report. The Vice-Chairman served as alternate for the Chairman. Alternates acted in the absence of the regular members whom they represented and frequently attended meetings together with their principals. They participated in all discussions but voted only in the absence of their principals.

The Committee held 15 public hearings during which 71 citizens, appearing either as representatives of organizations or as individuals, were interviewed and a record was made of their testimony. A great amount of additional information was assembled for use of the Committee. No record was kept of the discussions taking place in executive sessions.

Under the Chairmanship of Mr. Leland M. Kaiser, a Sub-Committee on Revenue and Taxation, composed of five members of this Committee and three experts on municipal finance, devoted nearly two months to the preparation of a report on revenue and taxation which is submitted as Exhibit A and is the basis for our General Committee's recommendations on revenue and taxation on pages 17 through 21 of the attached report. The Sub-Committee also heard full expressions of opinion by individual citizens, city officials and representatives of organized groups.

Mr. T. R. Letts, Executive Secretary to the Mayor of San Francisco, served with the Committee and participated in its discussions. He prepared agenda for meetings and supervised the secretarial personnel. His advice and assistance were of inestimable value.

A record of the meetings and attendance of Committee members, together with minutes of each meeting and copies of information submitted to the Committee, are appended. (Exhibit B.)



The Committee desires to pay tribute to the City Planning Commission and its staff, under the direction of Mr. L. Deming Tilton, for its cooperation in submitting statistical and engineering data, and other information; for the help extended by Honorable T. A. Brooks, Chief Administrative Officer, and Honorable Harold J. Boyd, Controller.

It also wishes to express its appreciation to representatives of the various City Departments who impressed it as being conscientious and thorough in their representations and to those men and women who appeared on behalf of civic organizations or as individuals. Almost without exception their proposals have merit, and while all could not be included in the recommendations made by this Committee, the enthusiasm and interest displayed by these citizens reflect a wholesome condition. Their attitudes are indicative of the fact that the people of San Francisco are aware of the deficiencies in the City's facilities and are determined to do their part toward building a greater San Francisco. The names of all who appeared before the Committee, together with the projects advocated by them, are appended. (Exhibit C.)

From the outset the Committee recognized the necessity of a Master Plan to guide the future development of the City, and of weighing the many plans for postwar construction in their relation to such a plan. It rejected the idea of approving individual projects as such and instead considered their relative importance to the over-all needs of the City. It believes that the programs of all City Departments should be better interrelated than has been the practice in the past, and that they should be coordinated with the Master Plan. All programs and plans should be subject to constant re-examination and expansion as the needs of a growing city dictate.

In order that this reexamination can be assured and the postwar construction plans furthered, the Committee urges most strongly that there be

The Committee desires to say further to the City Planning Commission

and its staff, under the direction of Mr. J. Lewis Brown, for its cooperation

in collecting statistical and engineering data and other information for the

work entrusted by the Board of Commissioners, City Planning Commission, and

the Board of Commissioners.

It also wishes to express its appreciation to the members of the

various City Departments who have assisted in the collection and analysis

of their respective data and in the preparation of the report.

of civic organizations and of individuals. Their interest and cooperation

in this work has been most helpful and will be included in the recommendations

made by this Commission. The Commission and its staff are indebted to these citizens

for their wholehearted cooperation. Their assistance and contribution to the

work of the Commission is most appreciated and will be included in the City

Planning and its recommendations to the Board of Commissioners.

The Board of Commissioners is most indebted to the Commission, together with

its staff, for their cooperation and assistance.

Very truly yours, Board of Commissioners

John H. Brown, Chairman

John H. Brown, Chairman

John H. Brown, Chairman

John H. Brown, Chairman

John H. Brown, Chairman

John H. Brown, Chairman

John H. Brown, Chairman

John H. Brown, Chairman

In order that this information can be secured and the further

construction plans prepared, the Commission requests that the Board of

appointed by the Mayor, with the approval of the Board of Supervisors, a small working committee consisting of citizens and key City officials. When a postwar program is adopted, this committee should be charged with the responsibility of seeing the program through, and making such adjustments in it from time to time as would be required by changing conditions.

We believe that San Francisco has become careless and allowed itself to "run down at the heels." The situation is far from hopeless, but it can become very serious in a surprisingly short time unless the City proceeds to correct its deficiencies and takes advantage of the opportunities now knocking at its door.

Our City is the undisputed capital of the West. It was that long before the United Nations Conference met here. But our own complacency and, later, military secrecy concerning war activities in the Bay Area, have tended to obscure the real facts.

San Francisco's future has been recognized by important business interests of the East and other sections of the country, as evidenced by the extensive investments recently made by such nationally-known firms as R. H. Macy of New York, F. W. Woolworth, Western Crown Cork and Seal, Bullock-Magnin, Sears-Roebuck and Company, and Apparel City Corporation. Several large downtown real estate transactions involving in excess of \$500,000 each, hotel and apartment house sales, as well as announced expansion of many leading department stores, all attest to the fact that business has faith in San Francisco.

San Francisco must have faith in itself! It must meet the challenge by planning courageously, building solidly and constructively, so that it will be equipped to meet its destiny as one of the first cities of the world.

Yours respectfully,

---

Adrien J. Falk, Chairman

---

Lloyd H. Fisher

---

Silas H. Palmer

---

Wm. G. Merchant, V-Chairman

---

For Leland M. Kaiser

---

For Wendell Phillips

...by the ... of the ... of ...

... of ... and ...

... of ...

... of ...

... of ...

... of ...

... of ...

... of ...

... of ...

... of ...

... of ...

... of ...

... of ...

... of ...

... of ...

... of ...

... of ...

... of ...

... of ...

... of ...

... of ...

... of ...

... of ...

... of ...

... of ...

... of ...

... of ...

... of ...

... of ...

... of ...

... of ...

... of ...

Mrs. Paul Eliel, Secretary

Chester R. MacPhee

Adolph Uhl

For Nadeau Bourgeault

Wm. J. Nasser

Carl F. Wente

Ralph R. Brunton

Carroll Newburgh

Alternate Members:

F. S. Baer

Sylvester J. McAtce

Charles P. Burgess

Dewey Mead

Mrs. Morse Erskine

Alfred Henry Meyer

Arnold Grunigen, Jr.

Edward L. Siller

Cyril Magnin

Lloyd Taylor

Edward T. Mancuso

Virginia Woods

1890	1891	1892
1893	1894	1895
1896	1897	1898
1899	1900	1901

1902

1902	1903
1904	1905
1906	1907
1908	1909
1910	1911

CITIZENS' POST WAR PLANNING COMMITTEE

On October 1, 1944, the San Francisco City Planning Commission issued a preliminary 6-year program for planning, land acquisition and construction. It selected 277 projects totaling \$131,179,000 out of 553 projects totaling \$280,969,000 submitted by all departments of the City government and the City Planning Commission itself.

Under date of April 24, 1945, the City Planning Commission amended its 6-year program to projects totaling \$131,847,294. It reported that \$42,839,898 of this total represented funds on hand or anticipated from revenue producing departments and \$89,007,396 funds which would have to be provided.

The City Planning Commission's report has been carefully thought out and is the basis for many of the recommendations made by this Committee. This committee goes further and recommends, in addition to a 6-year program, a continuing program that encompasses a Master-Plan.

Based on the July 1945 assessment roll, the amount of general bonds which still can be issued, for other than water purposes, is limited to \$103,734,369, computed as follows:

Charter limitation (12% of assessed valuation)		* \$146,009,369
Bonds outstanding and unmatured		29,025,000
		<u>\$116,984,369</u>
Bonds authorized but presently unsold		
Sewers	\$12,000,000	
Juvenile Home	<u>1,250,000</u>	<u>13,250,000</u>
Maximum which can be authorized.		\$103,734,369

\*(This limit could be increased by amendment to the City Charter, if in the opinion of the City officials this is deemed the proper course to expedite the program of postwar construction.)

The City Planning Commission's amended report recommends the raising of funds totaling \$89,007,396 out of this maximum of \$103,734,369. It distributes these funds so that each department will participate to some extent. It does not attempt to project the rest of the Master Plan or its financing.

This Committee has run into the very difficulties that confronted the Planning Commission. We concur in its findings that traffic, transit and related projects are of first consideration. Unless means are found to move people freely in and out of the City and within the City limits and to provide adequate off-street parking facilities; our community cannot reach its full development, business cannot expand and



there is the danger that business normally done in the City will be forced away. This would bring about a reduction of our over-all assessed valuation.

The key to the traffic and transit problem lies in the relief of congestion on Market Street. It cannot be effected within the available bond limit of \$103,734,369, and at the same time construct the Airport and complete the other necessary features of the program. This means that within the available funds, we can expect only the beginning of the solution to the Market Street problem in the years immediately ahead.

Following is a table listing all the projects that have been approved by this Committee in the order of their urgency and importance as we see it. Note on Table #2 (Page 14) that the funds allocated to the Recreation, Fire and Police Departments and for Tideland Development have in each instance been divided into two parts carrying different priorities.

there is the danger that business normally done in the City will be forced away.

This would bring about a reduction of our overall business situation.

The key to the solution of this problem is the effect of transportation in

the City. It cannot be stated that the situation is as bad as it is.

and it is not clear that the situation is as bad as it is.

of the situation. This is not the case. It is not clear that the situation is as bad as it is.

statement of the situation. It is not clear that the situation is as bad as it is.

about the situation.

There is a serious situation in the City and it is not clear that the situation is as bad as it is.

There is a serious situation in the City and it is not clear that the situation is as bad as it is.

There is a serious situation in the City and it is not clear that the situation is as bad as it is.

There is a serious situation in the City and it is not clear that the situation is as bad as it is.

There is a serious situation in the City and it is not clear that the situation is as bad as it is.

Table No. 1  
PROJECTS

Priorities	SUBMITTED BY CITY DEPARTMENT	APPROVED BY CITY PLANNING COMMISSION IN 6-YEAR PROGRAM	APPROVED BY THIS COMMITTEE	INCLUDE IN ANNUAL BUDGETS	METHOD OF FINANCE REVENUE PRODUCING (pay-as-you-go or Bond Issue, as required)	GENERAL BOND ISSUE AND FUNDS DERIVED FROM OTHER SOURCES
1	San Francisco Airport	20,000,000	20,000,000	3,000,000		20,000,000
2	Market Street Problem Engineering Studies and detailed plans & specifications		3,000,000			3,000,000
2	Street Railway Rehabilitation (1) Construction Rolling Stock	8,030,426 15,338,700	8,030,426 15,338,700		8,030,426 15,338,700	
2	Streets and Highways	32,355,600	18,694,000	17,544,000		17,544,000
2	Motor Terminals - Off-Street Parking - Revolving Fund		3,000,000	3,000,000		3,000,000
3	School Department	15,575,000	6,957,500	15,575,000	15,575,000	
3-13	Recreation Department	10,468,715	3,613,701	10,468,715	2,468,715	8,000,000
3	Public Health Department Remodeling-additions-repairs	2,630,000	705,400	2,630,000	2,630,000	
3	Water Department )--26,233,669 Supply & Distn. ) Less Funds on hand or anticipated --16,271,669	9,962,000	9,962,000	(2)	9,962,000 (2)	
4	Sewers Less funds provided-25,600,475 DPW Report 5/2/45 -15,905,500	9,694,975	9,694,975	9,694,975 (3)		



PROJECT	SUBMITTED BY CITY DEPARTMENT	APPROVED BY CITY PLANNING COMMISSION IN 6-year program	APPROVED BY THIS COMMITTEE		INCLUDE IN ANNUAL BUDGETS	METHOD OF FINANCE	
						REVENUE PRODUCING (pay-as-you-go or Bond Issue, as required.	GENERAL FUND ISSUE AND FUNDS DERIVED FROM OTHER SOURCES
4 Board of Public Works Warehouse for Voting Machines 188,000 Yards, offices & shops, maintenance bureau 1,185,000	1,373,000	1,373,000	1,373,000				1,373,000
5 Urban Redevelopment Sites		2,100,000	2,100,000				2,100,000
6-22 Tidelands Development		4,000,000	4,000,000				4,000,000
7 Street Lighting	4,309,300	1,138,150	4,309,300		4,309,300		
7-15 Fire Department Repair Engine House 551,000 New Engine Houses 1,353,000 Headquarters Building 572,000 High Pressure System 3,406,500 Cistern 500,000	6,382,500	2,868,000	6,382,500		1,904,000		4,478,500
8-23 Police Department Repairs & New Stations 697,000 Traf. Bur. & Courts Bldg. 350,000 Headquarters Building 2,095,000	3,142,000	2,483,000	3,142,000		697,000		2,445,000
9 Park Department	12,017,500	3,715,500	7,215,500		3,715,500		3,500,000
10 Sixth-Seventh Street Freeway Extension	8,000,000	8,000,000	8,000,000				8,000,000
11 Sixth Street Viaduct	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000				5,000,000
12 Separation of Grades Division - 13th Street	6,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000				6,000,000



PROJECT	SUBMITTED BY CITY DEPARTMENT	APPROVED BY CITY PLAN- NING COMMISS- SION IN 6- YEAR PROGRAM	APPROVED BY THIS COMMITTEE	METHOD OF FINANCE	
				INCLUDE IN ANNUAL BUD- GETS	GENERAL BOND ISSUE & FUNDS DERIVED FROM OTHER SOURCES
				REVENUE PRODUC- ING (pay-as- you-go or Bond Issue, as re- quired)	
14 Broadway Tunnel	3,200,000	3,200,000	3,200,000		3,200,000
16 Civic Auditorium-Renodeling Interior	445,000		445,000		445,000
17 Public Library Department Branches Main Library	1,206,800 501,800 705,000	584,400	1,206,800	501,800	705,000
18 Courts Building Civil Courts Bldg. City Hall Alterations Civic Center Power House - Addn.	6,409,000 5,350,000 904,000 <u>155,000</u>	300,000	6,409,000		6,409,000
19 Municipal Garage			600,000		600,000
20 County Jails #1 #2	587,500 137,500 450,000	587,500	587,500		587,500
21 Museums De Young Legion of Honor	1,174,624 1,095,724 78,900	685,894	1,174,624	332,874	841,750
24 Triangle of Land-Civic Center			<u>1,065,000</u>		
				<u>177,454,040</u>	<u>1,065,000</u>
				41,829,164	33,331,126
					102,293,750

(1) Street Railway Rehabilitation:

Based on Newton Report.

(2) San Joaquin Valley Pipeline

(3) Includes North Point Sewerage Treatment Plant \$7,470,000

(See explanation on next page)



As the foregoing Table #1 shows, this Committee has approved projects totaling \$177,454,040 to be financed in the following ways:

1 - Inclusion in annual budgets	\$ 41,829,164
2 - Revenue Producing (pay-as-you-go or bond issue, as required)	33,331,126
3 - To be financed by general bond issues and funds derived from other sources	<u>102,293,750</u>
TOTAL:	\$177,454,040

1 - PROGRAM APPROVED FOR INCLUSION IN ANNUAL BUDGETS \$ 41,829,164

---

SCHOOL DEPARTMENT	\$15,575,000
SEWERS	9,694,975
ALL OTHER DEPARTMENTS	<u>16,559,189</u>

The sum approved for sewers includes \$7,470,000 for construction of the North Point Sewage Treatment Plant. This Committee was prepared to recommend a general bond issue for this purpose but refrained from doing so on the advice of Mr. Thomas A. Brooks, Chief Administrative Officer, who stated that in all probability funds for this construction would be forthcoming from either State or Federal sources.

The sums approved above for inclusion in annual budgets for departments other than the School Department total \$26,254,164, and are largely for alterations, repairs and renewals.

The following table discloses that these same departments (exclusive of the School Department) were allotted in the 1945-46 budget, \$2,827,348 for capital expenditures and improvements of which \$2,524,502 were for improvements and land purchases.

Provision in annual budgets of approximately the same amounts for nine or ten consecutive years would finance the alterations, repairs and improvements covered in this section of our report.

As the Corporation has not been organized, this liability is not enforceable.

\$177,454.00 to be included in the following items:

1 - Insurance in amount of \$177,454.00

2 - Reserve for depreciation (estimated) on fixed assets, as follows:

3 - The estimated general fund balance and funds available for other purposes

177,454.00

1 - PROPOSED AMOUNT FOR RESERVE IN GENERAL FUND

\$ 177,454.00

SCHOOL DEPARTMENT  
BALANCE  
ALL OTHER DEPARTMENTS

The sum reported for reserve, including \$177,454.00, is the total of the funds

of the Corporation. This Corporation has no other funds or resources.

There is no other fund or resource but this fund which is the only fund of the Corporation.

A. Frank, Chief Administrative Officer, who stated that in all, approximately \$177,454.00

for this Corporation would be forthcoming from the State or Federal Government.

The sum reported for reserve is included in the general fund of the Corporation.

There is no other fund or resource but this fund which is the only fund of the Corporation.

Reserve for depreciation

The following table shows the amount of the reserve for depreciation of the

School Department, which is included in the 1945-46 report, \$177,454.00 for depreciation

on fixed assets, including \$177,454.00 for depreciation on fixed assets.

Provision

Provision in amount of \$177,454.00 for depreciation on fixed assets.

Provision in amount of \$177,454.00 for depreciation on fixed assets.

This section contains

	Approved by this Committee	Capital Expenditure and Improvements - Mayor Lapham's letter July 2, 1945	Improvements and Land Purchases only (submitted by analyst of Board of Supervisors)
Sewers	\$ 9,694,975	\$1,514,500	\$1,462,500
Recreation Dept.	2,468,715	177,828	119,552
Public Health Dept.	2,630,000	97,650	2,550
Street Lighting	4,309,300	164,200	143,700
Fire Dept.	1,904,000	302,550	290,000
Police Dept.	697,000	157,000	1 3,000
Park Dept.	3,715,500	282,200	282,200
Public Library	501,800	131,420	120,000
Museums	332,874		1,000
	\$26,254,164	\$2,827,348	\$2,524,502
Juvenile Dept.		55,000	55,000
Public Buildings		98,000	12,000
Public Works (General)		125,000	
	\$26,254,164	\$3,105,348	\$2,591,502
School Dept.	15,575,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
	\$41,829,164	\$4,605,348	\$4,091,502



2 - <u>REVENUE PRODUCING</u> (pay-as-you-go or Bond Issue, as required)	\$33,331,126
--	--------------

---

STREET RAILWAY REHABILITATION	23,369,126
-------------------------------	------------

WATER DEPARTMENT	9,962,000
------------------	-----------

STREET RAILWAY REHABILITATION

We concur in the recommendation of our Sub-committee on Revenue and Taxation that the cost of rehabilitating the street railway system should be provided from the revenues of this utility. It may become necessary on occasion to issue some bonds for construction purposes or for the purchase of rolling stock in advance of the receipt of revenues available for such purposes. This can be done either with general obligation or revenue bonds. It is noteworthy to consider that general obligation bonds will be less costly.

WATER DEPARTMENT

The Water Department's overall requirements for supply and distribution total	\$26,233,669
--	--------------

The Department reports that it has funds on hand or anticipated from revenues:	16,271,669
---	------------

This leaves additional requirements of the Department of:	9,962,000
---	-----------

The principal capital requirement of the Department is the building of a second San Joaquin Valley Pipeline at an approximate cost of \$10,000,000. This Committee recommends that the construction of this pipeline be financed by the sale of \$10,000,000 general obligation bonds to be paid out of revenues. Such bonds are exempt from the general debt limit. However, it is our further recommendation that these bonds be offered for sale in two installments, the first, for \$5,000,000 to cover the first section of the pipeline which involves about one-half of the construction and would provide additional capacity of from 16 to 19 mgd. According to the Department, this additional capacity might suffice the needs of the district for the next ten years, in which event it would not be necessary to offer the remaining \$5,000,000 bonds until the expiration of that period.

3 - <u>PROJECTS TO BE FINANCED BY GENERAL BOND ISSUES</u> and funds derived from other sources.	\$102,293,750
--	---------------

---

Following is a table of all the projects that have been approved by this Committee, to be financed by general bond issues, and funds derived from other sources, listed in the order of their urgency and importance:

2 - [illegible]  
[illegible]

100,000,000

100,000,000

100,000,000

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible text block]

[illegible]

[illegible]

100,000,000

[illegible]

100,000,000

[illegible]

100,000,000

[illegible text block]

[illegible]

100,000,000

[illegible text block]

TABLE # 2

<u>PRIORITY</u>	<u>PROJECT</u>	<u>ESTIMATED COST</u>
1 -	San Francisco Airport	\$ 20,000,000
2 -	Market Street Problem (Study and plans)	3,000,000
	Streets and Highways	17,544,000
	Army Street	300,000
	Islais Creek Bridge	1,250,000
	Portola Drive	5,500,000
	Division & 13th Street	1,070,000
	Waller Street	4,130,000
	Traffic Signals	500,000
	Industrial & Selby	450,000
	Mission St. Rehabilitation	814,000
	Street Car Thoroughfares	<u>3,500,000</u>
	Motor Terminals - off-street parking	3,000,000
3 -	Recreation Department (first allotment)	4,000,000
4 -	Board of Public Works Buildings	1,373,000
5 -	Urban Redevelopment Sites	2,100,000
6 -	Tideland Development - Land Purchase	215,000
7 -	Fire Department (First allotment)	2,578,500
8 -	Police Department - Hall of Justice	2,095,000
9 -	Park Department	3,500,000
10 -	6th-7th Street Freeway Extension	8,000,000
11 -	6th Street Viaduct	5,000,000
12 -	Separation of Grades-Division & 13th Streets	6,000,000
13 -	Recreation Department (Second allotment)	4,000,000
14 -	Broadway Tunnel	3,200,000
15 -	Fire Department (Second allotment)	1,900,000
16 -	Civic Auditorium - remodelling	445,000
17 -	Library Department - Main Library	705,000
18 -	Courts Building and alterations and additions to City Hall and Civic Center Power House	6,409,000
19 -	Municipal Garage	600,000
20 -	County Jails	567,500
21 -	Museums	841,750
22 -	Tidelands Development, fill, etc. (Second allotment)	3,785,000
23 -	Police Department-Traffic Courts Bldg. (Second Allot.)	350,000
24 -	Triangle of Land - Civic Center	1,065,000

DATE	PAGE	NO.	NAME	ADDRESS	CITY	STATE	ZIP	TELEPHONE	FAX	E-MAIL	OTHER
10/10/99	1	1	John Doe	123 Main St	New York	NY	10001	212-555-1234			
10/11/99	2	2	Jane Smith	456 Elm St	Los Angeles	CA	90001	213-555-5678			
10/12/99	3	3	Bob Johnson	789 Oak St	Chicago	IL	60601	312-555-9012			
10/13/99	4	4	Alice Brown	101 Pine St	San Francisco	CA	94101	415-555-3456			
10/14/99	5	5	Charlie Davis	202 Cedar St	Phoenix	AZ	85001	602-555-7890			
10/15/99	6	6	Diana Evans	303 Birch St	Philadelphia	PA	19101	215-555-2345			
10/16/99	7	7	Frank Green	404 Maple St	San Diego	CA	92101	619-555-6789			
10/17/99	8	8	Grace Hall	505 Elm St	Seattle	WA	98101	206-555-0123			
10/18/99	9	9	Henry Lee	606 Oak St	Portland	OR	97201	503-555-4567			
10/19/99	10	10	Ivy King	707 Pine St	San Jose	CA	95101	408-555-8901			
10/20/99	11	11	Jack Lister	808 Cedar St	San Antonio	TX	78201	214-555-2345			
10/21/99	12	12	Karen Miller	909 Birch St	San Luis Obispo	CA	93401	805-555-6789			
10/22/99	13	13	Leo Nelson	1010 Maple St	San Marcos	CA	92371	760-555-0123			
10/23/99	14	14	Mary O'Brien	1111 Elm St	San Mateo	CA	94401	650-555-4567			
10/24/99	15	15	Ned Parker	1212 Oak St	San Rafael	CA	94901	415-555-8901			
10/25/99	16	16	Olivia Quinn	1313 Pine St	San Ramon	CA	94583	925-555-2345			
10/26/99	17	17	Peter Reed	1414 Cedar St	San Jose	CA	95128	408-555-6789			
10/27/99	18	18	Quinn Scott	1515 Birch St	San Jose	CA	95128	408-555-0123			
10/28/99	19	19	Rachel Taylor	1616 Maple St	San Jose	CA	95128	408-555-4567			
10/29/99	20	20	Sam Vance	1717 Elm St	San Jose	CA	95128	408-555-8901			
10/30/99	21	21	Tina White	1818 Oak St	San Jose	CA	95128	408-555-2345			
10/31/99	22	22	Uma Young	1919 Pine St	San Jose	CA	95128	408-555-6789			
11/01/99	23	23	Victor Zane	2020 Cedar St	San Jose	CA	95128	408-555-0123			
11/02/99	24	24	Wendy Adams	2121 Birch St	San Jose	CA	95128	408-555-4567			
11/03/99	25	25	Xavier Baker	2222 Maple St	San Jose	CA	95128	408-555-8901			
11/04/99	26	26	Yvonne Carter	2323 Elm St	San Jose	CA	95128	408-555-2345			
11/05/99	27	27	Zoe Evans	2424 Oak St	San Jose	CA	95128	408-555-6789			
11/06/99	28	28	Adam Foster	2525 Pine St	San Jose	CA	95128	408-555-0123			
11/07/99	29	29	Bella Grant	2626 Cedar St	San Jose	CA	95128	408-555-4567			
11/08/99	30	30	Carl Harris	2727 Birch St	San Jose	CA	95128	408-555-8901			
11/09/99	31	31	Dora Ives	2828 Maple St	San Jose	CA	95128	408-555-2345			
11/10/99	32	32	Ethan Jones	2929 Elm St	San Jose	CA	95128	408-555-6789			
11/11/99	33	33	Fiona King	3030 Oak St	San Jose	CA	95128	408-555-0123			
11/12/99	34	34	George Lee	3131 Pine St	San Jose	CA	95128	408-555-4567			
11/13/99	35	35	Helen Miller	3232 Cedar St	San Jose	CA	95128	408-555-8901			
11/14/99	36	36	Ian Nelson	3333 Birch St	San Jose	CA	95128	408-555-2345			
11/15/99	37	37	Julia O'Brien	3434 Maple St	San Jose	CA	95128	408-555-6789			
11/16/99	38	38	Kyle Parker	3535 Elm St	San Jose	CA	95128	408-555-0123			
11/17/99	39	39	Laura Quinn	3636 Oak St	San Jose	CA	95128	408-555-4567			
11/18/99	40	40	Mark Reed	3737 Pine St	San Jose	CA	95128	408-555-8901			
11/19/99	41	41	Nancy Scott	3838 Cedar St	San Jose	CA	95128	408-555-2345			
11/20/99	42	42	Oscar Taylor	3939 Birch St	San Jose	CA	95128	408-555-6789			
11/21/99	43	43	Pamela Vance	4040 Maple St	San Jose	CA	95128	408-555-0123			
11/22/99	44	44	Quinn White	4141 Elm St	San Jose	CA	95128	408-555-4567			
11/23/99	45	45	Rachel Young	4242 Oak St	San Jose	CA	95128	408-555-8901			
11/24/99	46	46	Sammy Zane	4343 Pine St	San Jose	CA	95128	408-555-2345			
11/25/99	47	47	Tina Adams	4444 Cedar St	San Jose	CA	95128	408-555-6789			
11/26/99	48	48	Uma Baker	4545 Birch St	San Jose	CA	95128	408-555-0123			
11/27/99	49	49	Victor Carter	4646 Maple St	San Jose	CA	95128	408-555-4567			
11/28/99	50	50	Wendy Evans	4747 Elm St	San Jose	CA	95128	408-555-8901			
11/29/99	51	51	Xavier Foster	4848 Oak St	San Jose	CA	95128	408-555-2345			
11/30/99	52	52	Yvonne Grant	4949 Pine St	San Jose	CA	95128	408-555-6789			
12/01/99	53	53	Zoe Harris	5050 Cedar St	San Jose	CA	95128	408-555-0123			
12/02/99	54	54	Adam Ives	5151 Birch St	San Jose	CA	95128	408-555-4567			
12/03/99	55	55	Bella King	5252 Maple St	San Jose	CA	95128	408-555-8901			
12/04/99	56	56	Carl Lee	5353 Elm St	San Jose	CA	95128	408-555-2345			
12/05/99	57	57	Dora Miller	5454 Oak St	San Jose	CA	95128	408-555-6789			
12/06/99	58	58	Ethan Nelson	5555 Pine St	San Jose	CA	95128	408-555-0123			
12/07/99	59	59	Fiona O'Brien	5656 Cedar St	San Jose	CA	95128	408-555-4567			
12/08/99	60	60	George Parker	5757 Birch St	San Jose	CA	95128	408-555-8901			
12/09/99	61	61	Helen Quinn	5858 Maple St	San Jose	CA	95128	408-555-2345			
12/10/99	62	62	Ian Reed	5959 Elm St	San Jose	CA	95128	408-555-6789			
12/11/99	63	63	Julia Scott	6060 Oak St	San Jose	CA	95128	408-555-0123			
12/12/99	64	64	Kyle Taylor	6161 Pine St	San Jose	CA	95128	408-555-4567			
12/13/99	65	65	Laura Vance	6262 Cedar St	San Jose	CA	95128	408-555-8901			
12/14/99	66	66	Mark White	6363 Birch St	San Jose	CA	95128	408-555-2345			
12/15/99	67	67	Nancy Young	6464 Maple St	San Jose	CA	95128	408-555-6789			
12/16/99	68	68	Oscar Zane	6565 Elm St	San Jose	CA	95128	408-555-0123			
12/17/99	69	69	Pamela Adams	6666 Oak St	San Jose	CA	95128	408-555-4567			
12/18/99	70	70	Quinn Baker	6767 Pine St	San Jose	CA	95128	408-555-8901			
12/19/99	71	71	Rachel Carter	6868 Cedar St	San Jose	CA	95128	408-555-2345			
12/20/99	72	72	Sammy Evans	6969 Birch St	San Jose	CA	95128	408-555-6789			
12/21/99	73	73	Tina Foster	7070 Maple St	San Jose	CA	95128	408-555-0123			
12/22/99	74	74	Uma Grant	7171 Elm St	San Jose	CA	95128	408-555-4567			
12/23/99	75	75	Victor Harris	7272 Oak St	San Jose	CA	95128	408-555-8901			
12/24/99	76	76	Wendy Ives	7373 Pine St	San Jose	CA	95128	408-555-2345			
12/25/99	77	77	Xavier King	7474 Cedar St	San Jose	CA	95128	408-555-6789			
12/26/99	78	78	Yvonne Lee	7575 Birch St	San Jose	CA	95128	408-555-0123			
12/27/99	79	79	Zoe Miller	7676 Maple St	San Jose	CA	95128	408-555-4567			
12/28/99	80	80	Adam Nelson	7777 Elm St	San Jose	CA	95128	408-555-8901			
12/29/99	81	81	Bella O'Brien	7878 Oak St	San Jose	CA	95128	408-555-2345			
12/30/99	82	82	Carl Parker	7979 Pine St	San Jose	CA	95128	408-555-6789			
12/31/99	83	83	Dora Quinn	8080 Cedar St	San Jose	CA	95128	408-555-0123			
1/01/00	84	84	Ethan Reed	8181 Birch St	San Jose	CA	95128	408-555-4567			
1/02/00	85	85	Fiona Scott	8282 Maple St	San Jose	CA	95128	408-555-8901			
1/03/00	86	86	George Taylor	8383 Elm St	San Jose	CA	95128	408-555-2345			
1/04/00	87	87	Helen Vance	8484 Oak St	San Jose	CA	95128	408-555-6789			
1/05/00	88	88	Ian White	8585 Pine St	San Jose	CA	95128	408-555-0123			
1/06/00	89	89	Julia Young	8686 Cedar St	San Jose	CA	95128	408-555-4567			
1/07/00	90	90	Kyle Zane	8787 Birch St	San Jose	CA	95128	408-555-8901			
1/08/00	91	91	Laura Adams	8888 Maple St	San Jose	CA	95128	408-555-2345			
1/09/00	92	92	Mark Baker	8989 Elm St	San Jose	CA	95128	408-555-6789			
1/10/00	93	93	Nancy Carter	9090 Oak St	San Jose	CA	95128	408-555-0123			
1/11/00	94	94	Oscar Evans	9191 Pine St	San Jose	CA	95128	408-555-4567			
1/12/00	95	95	Pamela Foster	9292 Cedar St	San Jose	CA	95128	408-555-8901			
1/13/00	96	96	Quinn Grant	9393 Birch St	San Jose	CA	95128	408-555-2345			
1/14/00	97	97	Rachel Harris	9494 Maple St	San Jose	CA	95128	408-555-6789			
1/15/00	98	98	Sammy Ives	9595 Elm St	San Jose	CA	95128	408-555-0123			
1/16/00	99	99	Tina King	9696 Oak St	San Jose	CA	95128	408-555-4567			
1/17/00	100	100	Uma Lee	9797 Pine St	San Jose	CA	95128	408-555-8901			

THIS COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS THAT THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
SUBMIT TWO GENERAL BOND ISSUES TO THE VOTERS OF SAN  
FRANCISCO AS SPEEDILY AS POSSIBLE, NAMELY:

1. \$20,000,000 to cover the San Francisco Airport development (already recommended in our letter of August 3, 1945 to the Mayor).
2. \$75,000,000 to apply against the other projects as hereinabove listed.

In addition to \$95,000,000 to be realized from the sale of bonds recommended by this Committee, there are on hand or available State matching funds for postwar plans and land purchases amounting to \$837,000. Therefore, the total sum available for capital improvements would be \$95,837,000.

Theoretically, if all the projects selected by this Committee were to be completed before income is derived from any other sources, it would result in the following deficit:

Funds available for all projects	\$95,837,000
Projects selected	<u>102,293,750</u>
Deficit	\$ 6,456,750

However, other income, which will be derived from the following sources, should be used to complete the program:

- (1) Gas Tax refunds from the State of California (exclusive of those applying to the Bayshore Freeway which has just been approved at an estimated over-all cost of \$26,000,000, of which the City's share will be \$8,000,000. A portion of Gas Tax refunds payable to the City by the State of California will be allocated to defray the cost of this project.) A portion of the remaining Gas Tax refunds will be applicable to construction of designated major streets provided for in this program. However, it is inadvisable to count on any income from this source, as additional funds thus derived may be necessary for subsequent street improvements not considered as part of this program.
- (2) Net income from San Francisco Airport, estimated by the Public Utilities Commission at \$7,157,552 for the first fifteen years. Part of this net income undoubtedly will be necessary to further Airport development. The balance should be applied to the payment of interest and the redemption of bonds and to that extent would release tax moneys for additional improvements under our program.
- (3) Ultimate recovery from sales of property used in development of motor terminals (off-street parking) - \$3,000,000. As this is a revolving fund, no recovery will be effected until it has served its purpose of helping provide motor terminals. This money would be used by the City to acquire necessary areas of property, which then would be sold to private interests for off-street parking purposes. When this program is completed, the money would revert to City funds for application against the general program.
- (4) Ultimate recovery of a portion of the original investment, from sale of redevelopment sites, estimated at \$1,400,000. As this is a revolving fund no recovery will be effected until sites have been assembled and sold, and as this is accomplished progressively, the money will become available for other projects.

THE JOINTED ROYAL CANAL  
AND THE JOINTED ROYAL CANAL  
AND THE JOINTED ROYAL CANAL

1. The Jointed Royal Canal is a canal of 100 miles in length, and is the longest canal in the world.

2. The Jointed Royal Canal is a canal of 100 miles in length, and is the longest canal in the world.

3. The Jointed Royal Canal is a canal of 100 miles in length, and is the longest canal in the world.

4. The Jointed Royal Canal is a canal of 100 miles in length, and is the longest canal in the world.

5. The Jointed Royal Canal is a canal of 100 miles in length, and is the longest canal in the world.

6. The Jointed Royal Canal is a canal of 100 miles in length, and is the longest canal in the world.

7. The Jointed Royal Canal is a canal of 100 miles in length, and is the longest canal in the world.

8. The Jointed Royal Canal is a canal of 100 miles in length, and is the longest canal in the world.

9. The Jointed Royal Canal is a canal of 100 miles in length, and is the longest canal in the world.

10. The Jointed Royal Canal is a canal of 100 miles in length, and is the longest canal in the world.

11. The Jointed Royal Canal is a canal of 100 miles in length, and is the longest canal in the world.

12. The Jointed Royal Canal is a canal of 100 miles in length, and is the longest canal in the world.

- (5) Ultimate recovery from sale of property created by tidelands development - \$4,000,000. As this is a revolving fund, no recovery will be effected until areas have been developed and sold, and as this is accomplished progressively, the money will become available for other projects.
- (6) Possible subventions from the Federal Government for Airport Development and sewerage and for any other projects included in this program.
- (7) Possible subventions from the State of California for any projects listed in this program.
- (8) Budgetary funds for capital outlays in excess of the \$2,591,502 appropriated for 1945-46 and recommended by this committee to be continued over the next ten years to finance the \$26,254,164 pay-as-you-go program for departments listed on page 12 of this report.
- (9) Income from adoption of the Boyd "Save-as-you-go" Plan, namely, the saving in annual interest and redemption charges in future years. Such charges decline sharply within the next several years from the current level, although these savings will be reduced by the sale of additional bonds previously authorized and others recommended in this report. The saving from the estimated peak level of debt service in the following ten years amounts to approximately \$10,000,000, assuming all recommended bonds are authorized and sold, or \$23,500,000 on the basis of the schedule on present outstanding bonds. Much larger amounts proportionately would accrue in twenty or thirty years.

-----cOo-----

Over a period of years the gradual redemption of the bond issue recommended in this report will provide for additional bonding capacity applicable to this program.

-----cOo-----

As an offset against anticipated income described in Sections 1 to 9 above, there will be additional annual maintenance charges attendant upon the enlarged or improved facilities of the various City departments created by this program. The extent of these additional costs can be determined through the Controller's office.

-----cOo-----

It is recommended that consideration be given to setting aside income derived from the sources listed in Sections 1 to 9 above, which are in excess of the total amount necessary to complete this program, for the purpose of helping finance the clearance of Market Street, which is covered in detail later in this report.



## RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FINANCING THE PROGRAM

The Committee recommends the following methods of financing our over-all program:

1. The Water Department should be financed by a suitable combination of bond issues and pay-as-you-go, all required revenues to be obtained from earnings of the system. We endorse a \$10,000,000 general obligation bond issue for the Hetch Hetchy pipe line.

2. The Municipal Railway program should also be self-sustaining from earnings, with construction money to be raised by bonds or pay-as-you-go, whichever method lends itself more appropriately to the fiscal schedule of the rehabilitation work. It is impossible to suggest specific methods of financing until the street railway program has been more definitely outlined by the responsible authorities.

If general obligation bonds are ultimately approved in lieu of higher costing revenue bonds or other financing methods, the Committee recommends that the Charter be amended to exclude such bonds from the general debt limit, with the provision that they be paid from revenues and not taxation.

3. Some \$41,829,164 of projects, including \$15,575,000 of School Department outlays and \$26,254,164 for other purposes, should be met on a pay-as-you-go basis. A portion of the school program may be paid from the sale of lands no longer required for school purposes. Annual budgetary appropriations for capital outlays at this year's rate of \$1,500,000 for schools and \$2,591,502 for general purposes would complete these improvements in approximately ten years. If State or Federal aid is received as anticipated, the term would be reduced accordingly.

4. The Committee recommends a \$95,000,000 general obligation bond issue, the service to be defrayed in part from certain sources of additional revenue and the balance from property taxes, all as outlined hereafter. This issue, together with \$837,000 from the State, should be sufficient to finance priorities 1 to 19 inclusive, having a gross cost of \$95,664,500.

*[Faint handwritten notes at the bottom of the page]*

1915

...and the rest of it

It is important to understand that the purpose of this document is to provide information to the public and not to provide a legal opinion. The information provided is for informational purposes only and should not be used as a basis for legal action. The information provided is for informational purposes only and should not be used as a basis for legal action.

Further information is being furnished by the Bureau of the Census.

we need not limit the scope of our inquiry to the present and the past.

1. The first of these is the fact that the Commission has not yet received any information from the Government of the United Kingdom regarding the proposed changes to the law of the United Kingdom regarding the treatment of the British Commonwealth of Nations.

that they do not know how to do it.

2017-01-01 to 2017-01-01

[illegible]

Copyright 1999 by the American Psychological Association or one of its allied publishers. This article is intended solely for the personal use of the individual user and is not to be disseminated broadly.

4. The Council as a permanent institution will be the

Source to be destroyed in 1972 when certain records of Department of Defense are destroyed.

Balance from, property taxes, 1947-1948, 1949-1950, 1951-1952, 1953-1954, 1955-1956, 1957-1958, 1959-1960, 1961-1962, 1963-1964, 1965-1966, 1967-1968, 1969-1970, 1971-1972, 1973-1974, 1975-1976, 1977-1978, 1979-1980, 1981-1982, 1983-1984, 1985-1986, 1987-1988, 1989-1990, 1991-1992, 1993-1994, 1995-1996, 1997-1998, 1999-2000, 2001-2002, 2003-2004, 2005-2006, 2007-2008, 2009-2010, 2011-2012, 2013-2014, 2015-2016, 2017-2018, 2019-2020, 2021-2022, 2023-2024, 2025-2026, 2027-2028, 2029-2030, 2031-2032, 2033-2034, 2035-2036, 2037-2038, 2039-2040, 2041-2042, 2043-2044, 2045-2046, 2047-2048, 2049-2050, 2051-2052, 2053-2054, 2055-2056, 2057-2058, 2059-2060, 2061-2062, 2063-2064, 2065-2066, 2067-2068, 2069-2070, 2071-2072, 2073-2074, 2075-2076, 2077-2078, 2079-2080, 2081-2082, 2083-2084, 2085-2086, 2087-2088, 2089-2090, 2091-2092, 2093-2094, 2095-2096, 2097-2098, 2099-2100, 2101-2102, 2103-2104, 2105-2106, 2107-2108, 2109-2110, 2111-2112, 2113-2114, 2115-2116, 2117-2118, 2119-2120, 2121-2122, 2123-2124, 2125-2126, 2127-2128, 2129-2130, 2131-2132, 2133-2134, 2135-2136, 2137-2138, 2139-2140, 2141-2142, 2143-2144, 2145-2146, 2147-2148, 2149-2150, 2151-2152, 2153-2154, 2155-2156, 2157-2158, 2159-2160, 2161-2162, 2163-2164, 2165-2166, 2167-2168, 2169-2170, 2171-2172, 2173-2174, 2175-2176, 2177-2178, 2179-2180, 2181-2182, 2183-2184, 2185-2186, 2187-2188, 2189-2190, 2191-2192, 2193-2194, 2195-2196, 2197-2198, 2199-2200, 2201-2202, 2203-2204, 2205-2206, 2207-2208, 2209-2210, 2211-2212, 2213-2214, 2215-2216, 2217-2218, 2219-2220, 2221-2222, 2223-2224, 2225-2226, 2227-2228, 2229-2230, 2231-2232, 2233-2234, 2235-2236, 2237-2238, 2239-2240, 2241-2242, 2243-2244, 2245-2246, 2247-2248, 2249-2250, 2251-2252, 2253-2254, 2255-2256, 2257-2258, 2259-2260, 2261-2262, 2263-2264, 2265-2266, 2267-2268, 2269-2270, 2271-2272, 2273-2274, 2275-2276, 2277-2278, 2279-2280, 2281-2282, 2283-2284, 2285-2286, 2287-2288, 2289-2290, 2291-2292, 2293-2294, 2295-2296, 2297-2298, 2299-2300, 2301-2302, 2303-2304, 2305-2306, 2307-2308, 2309-2310, 2311-2312, 2313-2314, 2315-2316, 2317-2318, 2319-2320, 2321-2322, 2323-2324, 2325-2326, 2327-2328, 2329-2330, 2331-2332, 2333-2334, 2335-2336, 2337-2338, 2339-2340, 2341-2342, 2343-2344, 2345-2346, 2347-2348, 2349-2350, 2351-2352, 2353-2354, 2355-2356, 2357-2358, 2359-2360, 2361-2362, 2363-2364, 2365-2366, 2367-2368, 2369-2370, 2371-2372, 2373-2374, 2375-2376, 2377-2378, 2379-2380, 2381-2382, 2383-2384, 2385-2386, 2387-2388, 2389-2390, 2391-2392, 2393-2394, 2395-2396, 2397-2398, 2399-2400, 2401-2402, 2403-2404, 2405-2406, 2407-2408, 2409-2410, 2411-2412, 2413-2414, 2415-2416, 2417-2418, 2419-2420, 2421-2422, 2423-2424, 2425-2426, 2427-2428, 2429-2430, 2431-2432, 2433-2434, 2435-2436, 2437-2438, 2439-2440, 2441-2442, 2443-2444, 2445-2446, 2447-2448, 2449-2450, 2451-2452, 2453-2454, 2455-2456, 2457-2458, 2459-2460, 2461-2462, 2463-2464, 2465-2466, 2467-2468, 2469-2470, 2471-2472, 2473-2474, 2475-2476, 2477-2478, 2479-2480, 2481-2482, 2483-2484, 2485-2486, 2487-2488, 2489-2490, 2491-2492, 2493-2494, 2495-2496, 2497-2498, 2499-2500, 2501-2502, 2503-2504, 2505-2506, 2507-2508, 2509-2510, 2511-2512, 2513-2514, 2515-2516, 2517-2518, 2519-2520, 2521-2522, 2523-2524, 2525-2526, 2527-2528, 2529-2530, 2531-2532, 2533-2534, 2535-2536, 2537-2538, 2539-2540, 2541-2542, 2543-2544, 2545-2546, 2547-2548, 2549-2550, 2551-2552, 2553-2554, 2555-2556, 2557-2558, 2559-2560, 2561-2562, 2563-2564, 2565-2566, 2567-2568, 2569-2570, 2571-2572, 2573-2574, 2575-2576, 2577-2578, 2579-2580, 2581-2582, 2583-2584, 2585-2586, 2587-2588, 2589-2590, 2591-2592, 2593-2594, 2595-2596, 2597-2598, 2599-2600, 2601-2602, 2603-2604, 2605-2606, 2607-2608, 2609-2610, 2611-2612, 2613-2614, 2615-2616, 2617-2618, 2619-2620, 2621-2622, 2623-2624, 2625-2626, 2627-2628, 2629-2630, 2631-2632, 2633-2634, 2635-2636, 2637-2638, 2639-2640, 2641-2642, 2643-2644, 2645-2646, 2647-2648, 2649-2650, 2651-2652, 2653-2654, 2655-2656, 2657-2658, 2659-2660, 2661-2662, 2663-2664, 2665-2666, 2667-2668, 2669-2670, 2671-2672, 2673-2674, 2675-2676, 2677-2678, 2679-2680, 2681-2682, 2683-2684, 2685-2686, 2687-2688, 2689-2

ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED HEREIN IS UNCLASSIFIED  
DATE 01-01-2001 BY 60322 UCBAW

008,44,269 to 700 from a patient, Chicago

5. The debt capacity provided by the retirement of existing bonds and those to be issued may be utilized, if desired, at a later date for financing priorities 20 to 24 inclusive, totaling \$6,629,250, and for such bonds as may later be approved for a solution of the Market Street problem. We estimate that more than \$50,000,000 of additional bonding capacity will become available through the fiscal year 1951-52. State and Federal subventions would have the dual effect of reducing the cost to the taxpayers and greatly expediting completion of the over-all program.

In addition to \$20,000,000 of bonds for the Airport and \$75,000,000 needed for projects 2 to 19 inclusive, provision must be made for the servicing of \$13,250,000 of sewer and Juvenile Home bonds now authorized but as yet unsold. This brings the total to be issued to \$108,250,000. The following table assumes that the bonds will mature over a twenty-five year period with reduced annual redemption requirements in the first five years and even maturities thereafter. An interest rate of  $1\frac{1}{2}\%$  is used. The schedule is subject to future adjustment to conform to the actual date and terms of the bond sale.

FISCAL YEAR	PRESENT INTEREST & REDEMPTION *	ADD NEW ISSUES		TOTAL REQUIREMENTS #
		INTEREST	REDEMPTION	
1945-46	\$4,948,007.50	\$ - - -	- - -	\$4,948,007.50
1946-47	4,510,070.00	1,623,750.00	\$2,710,000.00	8,843,820.00
1947-48	4,270,865.00	1,583,100.00	2,985,000.00	8,838,965.00
1948-49	3,454,220.00	1,538,325.00	3,845,000.00	8,837,545.00
1949-50	2,786,957.50	1,480,650.00	4,310,000.00	8,577,607.50
1950-51	2,690,857.50	1,416,000.00	4,400,000.00	8,506,857.50
1951-52	2,595,777.50	1,350,000.00	4,500,000.00	8,445,777.50
1952-53	1,728,325.00	1,282,500.00	4,500,000.00	7,510,825.00
1953-54	1,493,750.00	1,215,000.00	4,500,000.00	7,208,750.00
1954-55	1,343,550.00	1,147,500.00	4,500,000.00	6,991,050.00

Note: Total requirements continue to decline in subsequent years until the final maturities in 1970-71.

\* All municipal bond issues except for water and street railway.

# These totals would be reduced in the early years by the application of interest on temporary investments in government securities.



The difference between debt service requirements of the current year and the assumed figure for 1946-1947, which marks the peak of service requirements under the program, is just under \$3,900,000. Under date of June 15, 1945, our Sub-Committee on Revenue and Taxation submitted a report, made part of this record, in which it recommended a plan of taxation designed to support this program.

This Committee concurs in the findings of our Sub-Committee on Revenue and Taxation in principle, but has modified them in some particulars. Our recommendations follow:

Additional business licenses	\$1,000,000	25.6%
2½¢ amusement tax	1,000,000	25.6
Hetch-Hetchy bond assumption	600,000	15.4
Additional real estate tax	<u>1,300,000</u>	<u>33.3</u>
	\$3,900,000	100.0%

A lucrative business license ordinance was repealed several years ago for technical reasons and never reenacted. The proposed additional revenue from this source would bring the per-capita receipts for San Francisco (including revenue from existing license fees) to about \$2 per-capita. Many cities exceed this figure substantially, and the current trend is in the direction of increased business license fees throughout the State.

The amusement tax is being used with increasing frequency among progressive cities of the nation desiring to broaden their tax bases. It is a tax which no one is required to pay. It is levied to a considerable extent in accordance with the ability to pay. This theory of taxation has been recognized by the Federal Government in its war-time excise tax program and can logically be taken advantage of by the City for post-war reconstruction. The amusement tax has the further advantage of securing a little income from the large commuting population using our facilities. The Committee believes that the amount of the tax should be graduated according to the price of the ticket, possibly at the rate of one cent in twenty or twenty-five on the base rate, as may be determined by a detailed survey.



The property taxpayer has been carrying a varying share of interest and redemption on Hetch-Hetchy bonds for many years, even after considering the offsetting item of Water Department earnings applied to tax reduction. The Committee believes that the obligation to service these bonds (to the extent not met from power revenues) should be assumed in full by the Water Department as a stand-by charge, thus releasing tax money to service the post war construction program to the extent of \$600,000 net annually, on the basis of current budget estimates.

The \$1,300,000 annual balance necessary to finance the program would be raised from general property taxes, necessitating an additional tax rate of about 15.3¢ per \$100. The charge on the real property owner would be reduced if completion of pay-as-you-go budgetary items were extended over a longer period because of necessity or otherwise.

Under the proposed bond interest and redemption schedule, requirements begin to drop off noticeably after 1948-49 and by 1952-53 are \$1,333,000 lower than in 1946-47. This lower level of debt service provides a margin in which additional bond issues may be serviced to help provide the solution of the Market Street problem to complete the lower rated priorities or for other projects that at the time shall have been determined essential to the public welfare. In lieu of floating additional bonds, a portion of the supplemental program may be financed in whole or part on a pay-as-you-go basis and from the possible receipt of State and Federal grants.

Our Sub-Committee on Revenue and Taxation has recommended that the entire \$108,250,000 of bonds authorized or to be voted should be sold at one time to enable the City to avail itself of present low interest rates. Our general Committee also considers it advisable to establish a ceiling on the cost of money to be borrowed. However, we would modify the recommendation of our Sub-Committee to this extent: The bonds should be fed out as the market will absorb them, at the lowest possible cost to the City. It is our opinion that under existing conditions, the entire issue, running from one



to twenty-five years, could be sold in the neighborhood of  $1\frac{1}{2}\%$ . For example, the City of Oakland recently has sold \$15,754,000 of bonds, to run from one to forty years, at 1.22%.

Inasmuch as our program is a continuing one, the moneys realized from the sale of bonds could be reinvested in United States Treasury Bonds maturing at different times over a six-year period. Such investments might return an average of as much as  $1\frac{1}{4}\%$ , thus resulting in little loss in interest costs to the City. If it were necessary to invest in short-term Government Bonds, the return would be approximately  $3/4\%$  to  $7/8\%$ .



CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO  
CITIZENS' POST WAR PLANNING COMMITTEE  
GENERAL COMMENTS ON THE FOREGOING PROGRAM

In recommending a postwar construction program in the order of priority, this committee realizes that changing conditions may bring about need for some modification or change in the plans.

The committee believes that in order to insure this entire program being carried through to its conclusion, a small working committee consisting of citizens and key city officials, should be required by such legal means as would be necessary to keep this program active. This working committee should have the responsibility and authority for making such alterations in the program and the priorities of projects as changing conditions would necessitate. It should also be responsible for carrying out the program without undue delay and it is the recommendation of this Committee that within the scope of the finances available and of sound economy, every endeavor should be made to complete the program within six years from the time the projects are approved by the voters. Naturally the committee will call upon the City Planning Commission and other departments and officials of the City Government for information and advice.

This Committee considers all the projects enumerated ultimately essential but recognizes that they must be treated with some tolerance.

There has been some discussion as to whether or not decisions regarding the order of priorities should be predicated on the degree to which they contribute to employment, based on the assumption that we may be headed for a period of business recession in which it will be necessary to create widespread employment through public works. While we do not subscribe to the theory that there need be any long or widespread business recession in this community, such possibilities must be kept in mind. We are satisfied that the projects recommended by this Committee will require as much labor, by and large, as any other group of projects that might be selected.

As soon as urgent projects involving practical living are disposed of,



capital improvements for cultural programs should be supported generously. In the meantime, the cultural programs which are traditional and so vital to the life of this City should be sustained by adequate allocations in the annual budgets.

#### COMMENTS ON INDIVIDUAL PROJECTS

##### IN THE ORDER OF THEIR PRIORITIES AS LISTED ON TABLE NO. 1.

San Francisco Airport \$20,000,000

Priority No. 1

In giving our unqualified endorsement to this development, the Committee wishes to make it plain that the \$20,000,000 which would be invested in this airport development would not be a subsidy to private airlines. Statistics developed by Captain B. M. Doolin, Manager of the airport for the Public Utilities Commission, disclose that in the first fifteen years of the enlarged airport's operation, revenue estimated at more than \$7,000,000 would be collected by the City. Furthermore, in exchange for land supplied to the domestic and foreign carriers seeking facilities at Mills Field, these carriers would, after a stated period, turn over complete title to the hangars and other buildings which they would construct. As of today, according to Captain Doolin, there are employed in civilian activities alone at the San Francisco Airport more than 4500 persons receiving payrolls in excess of \$10,500,000 per year. Captain Doolin further estimates that the development of the airport as now planned by the Public Utilities Commission, with approval and support of numerous major airlines either presently operating there or desirous of entering those operations, will increase the employment at the airfield to 16,000 persons with an annual payroll of \$43,000,000.

When military conditions permit the full story of the role played by San Francisco and the Bay Area in war time aviation to be told, it will at once become obvious to all concerned that San Francisco has had an exceedingly important position in the world aviation picture since Pearl Harbor. Competition among American cities for the aviation industry already is becoming very keen. New York has expended more than \$50,000,000 on La Guardia Field and has begun work on Idlewyldo Airport which ultimately will cost \$100,000,000. Los Angeles voters recently approved by a majority of more than six to one a \$12,500,000 bond issue to go with \$3,000,000 already available for the development of Mines Field, which land requires little or no fill and all the money can be spent on run-ways, taxi-ways and airport buildings. Seattle and Tacoma recently



have joined in a common airport venture and are making bids, not only for trans-continental, but trans-Pacific lines. Los Angeles also is competing for trans-Pacific business. At present, the San Francisco area has the Eastern terminus of the trans-Pacific services of the Army Transport Service, Navy Transport Service, Pan American Airways, United Airways, as well as domestic operations of several major airlines, and applications have been made before the Civil Aeronautics Board by thirteen additional airline companies either to expand air carrier service to and from San Francisco or to inaugurate new service. Subsequent to those hearings, three applications already have been approved for short haul feeder service among the smaller cities of California and Oregon, all connecting with San Francisco. Other C.A.B. permits may be forthcoming and already the aviation industry has placed orders with manufacturers for more than \$150,000,000 worth of new aircraft. This figure belittles the total original cost of the entire fleet of airline airplanes operated by all domestic carriers at the start of this war, \$30,000,000. We must provide accommodations for these airlines, domestic and international, if San Francisco is to get the share of trade and travel which these airlines with their expanded services will bring. Facts upon facts pile up to make the airport development here not only an obvious necessity for San Francisco but one to be demanded at the earliest possible date.

Market Street Traffic and Transit Correction--  
For Study, Engineering, and Working Plans.

\$3,000,000

Priority #2

The problem of correcting the traffic and transit congestion of which Market Street is the crux has been given considerable preliminary study by the City Planning Commission, the Board of Public Works and the Public Utilities Commission. The department last named has only concerned itself in the mass transportation features of the problem. A number of plans have been under review, varying widely in scope. Some would reconstruct Market Street itself, others would clear the congestion by small or large loops through the central district, and others attempt to provide relief by the opening of parallel thoroughfares. For many weeks this committee has given this subject a great deal of consideration, but at this time it is not in position even to hazard an opinion as to which of the many plans suggested, or any combination or modification of them, is best.



We are convinced that no plan for the development of San Francisco will be complete or successful until it solves the difficulties presented by Market Street. It is our most important street, the principal artery of traffic and transportation throughout the central district. It is hopelessly congested. Intercommunication between the areas to the North and South of Market Street is seriously retarded because of its crowded condition and irregular broken development, with large numbers of dead-end streets on the North side. To some degree the present congestion on Market Street will be relieved with the modernization of our transit system along that thoroughfare, but that will be only the first step in providing the essential free, unrestricted flow of travel.

This Committee favors the plan that will give the largest long-term dividends to the greatest number of our citizens. Some important suggestions have been made, but in our opinion they offer only partial remedies. The problem will not be solved alone by such individual projects as (1) extensions of streets across Market Street, (2) overhead or underground cross streets, (3) development of parallel or other relief streets, (4) surface improvements on Market Street, or (5) traffic control devices on Market Street. Important as each of these might be individually, they fail to reach the core of the traffic problem, which involves the entire central business area. Whatever project is finally determined, the capacity of Market Street for traffic and transit should be doubled.

With these thoughts in mind all plans for the removal of tracks and resurfacing of Market Street should be thoroughly scrutinized and evaluated so that they will fit into the ultimate program. No other related street improvements should be pursued unless they are calculated to synchronize with the ultimate development. For example, the Board of Public Works and the City Planning Commission had recommended the allocation of \$1,150,000 for the improvement of Sansome, Second and Montgomery Streets. This is largely a land purchase program and would result in the extension of Sansome Street across Market between First and Second Streets and then extending diagonally to connect with Second



Street near Mission. While the project has considerable merit and would be a link in one of the downtown traffic loops under discussion, the Committee feels that this project should be deferred until the entire Market Street situation is determined. Then this particular proposal would be influenced by the decisions reached regarding the improvement of Market Street. For this reason, it would be inadvisable to proceed with land purchases now.

We are assured by the City Planning Commission that the related street and highway projects recommended in the report of this Committee are planned to conform with the over-all program.

The City has already made a number of studies at considerable cost for the solution of the problem presented by Market Street. This Committee does not recommend just another study, which might be done possibly for \$300,000. It does recommend a final study, together with the development of engineering and working plans, and for that reason has allocated \$3,000,000 for the purpose. It further recommends that the City Planning Commission and other City Departments involved be directed to proceed to cooperate in the immediate solution of this problem. Furthermore, we recommend that as soon as a report is made acceptable to the City officials, the Board of Supervisors take steps to finance and complete the project.

We reiterate that in our opinion the Market Street traffic and transit problem deserves a priority second only to the San Francisco Airport. Our recommendations do not include a sum sufficient to cover the over-all Market Street project because it is still in a formative stage, so it would be both impractical and in conflict with Charter provisions to set aside funds for that purpose now.

Street Railway Rehabilitation

\$23,369,126

Priority #2

The City Planning Commission estimates the cost of Street Railway Rehabilitation will be \$25,500,000. The Newton report lists it at \$23,369,126, which we have accepted.

The rehabilitation of the street railway system is a major priority. The voters of San Francisco recognized it when they approved a bond issue to purchase the Market Street Railway and consolidate it with the Municipal Railway.



It is not necessary to dwell here on the discomforts suffered by the public because of the inadequacies of present facilities. They are recognized by all, including the city officials. The Public Utilities Commission has planned to correct this condition just as soon as priorities for material and an easing of the labor situation will permit reconstruction, the purchase of new rolling stock and the additional employment of adequate personnel.

In touching on this subject briefly, the Committee does not wish to give the appearance of slighting the project, but in view of the fact that the Charter provides that each utility should be self-supporting, we feel it incumbent upon the Municipal Railway to devise its own financial program. This, therefore, eliminates the street railway rehabilitation program from our consideration, and the Committee only can express the conviction that this program is one the public demands be completed at the earliest possible date.

While the Public Utilities Commission and the Public Works Department generally cooperate in the repair and reconstruction of streets over which street cars are operated, it is possible that some money could be saved and greater efficiency effected by long range coordinated planning between the two departments. When tracks are removed or replaced, the Public Utilities Commission is responsible for the center street area and two feet on either side of the tracks. The Public Works Department is responsible for the remainder of the street area. It may be advisable for one department to assume the responsibility for the entire work. This is particularly important in view of the fact that our street and highway program, described in the succeeding section, is one of considerable magnitude.

#### Major Streets and Highways

\$17,544,000

#### Priority #2

The committee has devoted much of its time to the general problem of streets and street improvements, believing it to be so correlated with the general problem of free movement in and out and within the City as to be at the very core of things affecting the City's future. Irrespective of the amount of travel, any resident of the City or visitor to the City should be able to travel from one section to another without undue delays.

It is not necessary to state that the...

...of the ... of the ...

... of the ... of the ...

... of the ... of the ...

... of the ... of the ...

... of the ... of the ...

... of the ... of the ...

... of the ... of the ...

... of the ... of the ...

... of the ... of the ...

... of the ... of the ...

... of the ... of the ...

... of the ... of the ...

... of the ... of the ...

... of the ... of the ...

... of the ... of the ...

... of the ... of the ...

... of the ... of the ...

... of the ... of the ...

... of the ... of the ...

... of the ... of the ...

... of the ... of the ...

... of the ... of the ...

... of the ... of the ...

... of the ... of the ...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

San Francisco is a small area of barely 42 sq. miles and no part of the City should be more than 20 minutes from any other part. The recommendation of the Committee for major street improvements is in support of a joint program presented by the City Planning Commission and the Department of Public Works, and was arrived at by these two agencies June 27 after they had submitted separate programs to the Committee and these had been discussed over several meetings of the Postwar Committee.

Project No. 1 - Army St., San Jose Avenue, Guerrero St., Clipper St. _____	\$300,000
---	-----------

The Department of Public Works advises us that this sum is all that is needed to complete the financing of these four projects, that \$1,300,000 already is on hand.

The Army Street improvement would be for widening from Harrison to Guerrero, Guerrero Street from Army to north Market, and Guerrero Street south from Army continuing over San Jose Avenue to Bernal Cut, and Clipper Street, opening of street on western end from Portola Drive to Douglas.

These improvements would greatly ease traffic conditions in part of the Mission District, and are ready for construction as soon as the \$300,000 is obtained.

<u>Project No. 2 - Islais Creek Bridge</u>	\$1,250,000
--	-------------

Testimony before the committee points out that Third Street cannot be an effective main artery until the present Islais Creek Bridge bottleneck is corrected by the substitution of a new and wider structure. Inasmuch as Third Street serves an important residential area and also is a principal industrial thoroughfare, we agree with the suggestion that this requires early attention.

<u>Project No. 3 Portola Drive and Upper Market Street</u> _____	\$5,500,000
--	-------------

This project was the object of considerable debate by witnesses before the committee, there being the contention that a high-level tunnel for automobiles could be constructed at approximately the same cost as for the



widening and improvement of upper Market Street and Portola Drive. Proponents of the tunnel claim that the existing upper Market Street and Portola Drive would provide adequate access for residences already built or planned for the Twin Peaks District, whereas the tunnel would handle the through traffic with less grades.

Spokesmen for the Department of Public Works said, however, that to provide a tunnel at a sufficiently low altitude to eliminate the grade would mean the expenditure of far more than the estimated improvement of existing streets. They contend further that the realignment of Market Street particularly, and the elimination of sharp curves, would make the entire route over the hill one easily traveled. In relation to the tunnel, they also said that the cost of installing a ventilating system to remove exhaust fumes and other dangerous gases would be so great as to approximate the cost of the tunnel itself.

Project No. 4	
<u>Division and 13th Streets</u>	\$1,070,000

This would provide a connecting link between the new Bayshore Freeway (which the State has practically decided to construct through the Potrero District at a cost of \$26,000,000) and the San Francisco-Oakland Bridge. Thirteenth Street also would connect with the proposed Waller Street improvement, thereby increasing the importance of that cross-town literal.

Thirteenth Street would be widened and improved from Market Street to where Bryant and Eleventh Streets intersect; and Division Street, breaking off to the east, would be improved from Bryant to the Bayshore Freeway situated between San Bruno Avenue and Vermont Street.

Project No. 5	
<u>Waller Street</u>	\$4,130,000

We concur in the recommendation that Waller Street should be widened from Stanyan Street to Market Street, to connect with Thirteenth Street. The Waller Street program calls for a tunnel under Buena Vista Heights. This project would provide an important cross-town thoroughfare serving the northern Sunset, southern Richmond, and Parkland districts.



It also would flow into Mission Street, reconstruction of which is another recommendation in this report.

Project No. 6  
Traffic Signals

\$500,000

It is the feeling of the City's experts that the traffic signal system will require modernization and installations in connection with the general street and highway improvements. The system should be synchronized city-wide to provide rapid, continuous flow of traffic for considerable distances.

Project No. 7  
Industrial & Selby Streets

\$480,000

The development of Selby Street south from Evans Avenue to where it meets Industrial Street and connects with Alemany Boulevard, at the San Bruno Avenue intersection, would provide an important link in the cross city street system in the Butchertown area and would open up lands in that district. The private construction which would be encouraged in this area as a result of the street work would add to the assessment rolls sufficient properties to make this project a self-liquidating one in the long run.

Project No. 8  
Mission Street Reconstruction

\$814,000

Statistics of the Department of Public Works and of the City Planning Commission show Mission Street to be one of the really important arterials of San Francisco, servicing districts where possibly one-third to one-half of the city's residents either live or work. For this comparatively small sum the street can be improved for its entire length from the Embarcadero to the County line -- an expenditure of great worth.



Project #9  
Streetcar Thoroughfares

\$3,500,000

This project is one planned to improve streets throughout the City in conjunction with the rehabilitation of the Municipal Railway system, the removal of certain street car tracks and other reconstruction.

It is sound economics to "kill two birds with one dollar" wherever possible, and we are informed that the institution of this program in conjunction with the Municipal Railway rehabilitation wherever possible would save many thousands of dollars by doing the two jobs simultaneously. Such a policy is followed at present by City departments.

All of us must agree that street improvements of vital necessity in many districts can provide the basis for the rehabilitation of those areas where blight is so apparent today. There are streets in other areas which also require attention.

The streets to be affected by this program are, according to the Public Utilities Commission engineers:

LIST OF TRACKS SUGGESTED FOR POSTWAR RECONSTRUCTION

STREET	FROM	TO
<u>Market Street Railway Tracks</u>		
Carl	Clayton	Cole
Church	Duboce	16th
Embarcadero	Market	Mission
Fourth	Market	Townsend
Golden Gate Park	Lincoln Way	Fulton
Haight	Buchanan	Stanyan
Jackson	Steiner	Presidio Avenue
Lake	Arguello	6th Ave.
Market	Embarcadero	Valencia
Mission	8th Street	16th Street
Mission	College Ave.	Silver Ave.
Ocean Ave.	Junipero Serra	Onondaga
Onondaga	Ocean Ave.	Mission
Presidio Ave.	Jackson	California
Sacramento	Fillmore	Arguello Blvd.
Sixth Ave.	Fulton	Lake
Stanyan	Haight	Frederick
Sutter	Van Ness	Fillmore
Townsend	3rd Street	4th Street
<u>Municipal Railway</u>		
Brighton Ave.	Ocean	Grafton
California St. Line	Geary Blvd.	14th Ave.
California St.	14th Ave.	33rd Ave.
Eleventh St.	Market	Division
Geary Blvd.	10th Ave.	33rd Ave.
North Pt. etc.	Van Ness	Union
Potrero Ave.	Division	18th St.
Stockton	Market	Green
Twin Peaks Tunnel		
Van Ness, etc.	North Point	Scott

The foregoing list of street and highway recommendations, we repeat, is in support of a joint program prepared by the Dept. of Public Works and the City Planning Commission. The Committee feels that the projects listed are worthy individually and collectively, and realizes that it will be necessary to make such adjustment in the program as changing conditions will warrant. There were numerous other street and highway improvements or developments suggested and many of these are attached by letter in the report.



Off-Street Parking (Revolving Fund)

\$3,000,000

Priority #2

It would be pointless for the City to expend any important amount of money improving conditions for the flow of automobile traffic into the principal business and shopping districts if there were no places where the automobiles could be parked once they reached there. The Committee, therefore, has given a high priority to this recommendation with the additional thought that the development of adequate parking facilities should be encouraged by private funds, rather than by public funds, in the last analysis. The purpose of this \$3,000,000 revolving fund is for that encouragement.

The Committee believes that an investment of this type and size by the municipal government is of first importance but that the investment should be repaid over a period of years. Therefore, this project is one which actually should not cost the taxpayers a cent over the years because the money will be returned to the improvement fund and help to finance projects of lower priority.

School Department

\$15,575,000

Priority #3

Under the law as it affects the City and County of San Francisco, the Board of Education is an autonomous body insofar as budgeting is concerned. It has announced its intentions of going through with a building program costing \$15,575,000, of which \$13,218,000 will be needed in the first six fiscal years. This money will be provided from the general fund and can be offset by some other incomes. The School Department owns seventy-five pieces of property not presently used for educational purposes. Some of these properties are occupied by other departments of the City government. In some instances the properties have been improved by the other departments. It is our recommendation that unless the School Department plans to use them, the titles should be transferred to the departments presently using them and steps taken to reimburse the School Department at fair value. Such sums, together with funds realized from the sale of other school properties not used for school purposes, should be credited to the School Department's capital fund for the purpose of financing postwar improvements. Any additional sums needed should be raised on a tax-as-you-go basis.



Recreation Department

\$10,468,715

Priorities Nos. 3 and 13

San Francisco has for many years operated with a Recreation Department whose facilities have been far from adequate to provide the services to which our residents of all ages are entitled. The Department submitted an over-all program costing approximately \$11,532,715. The Committee feels strongly that the development of recreational facilities will pay dividends in many ways, but particularly from the social and public health standpoints.

The Committee recommends allocation of these funds, as follows:

From Annual Budgets	\$2,468,715
Priority #3 from proceeds of bond sales	4,000,000
Priority #13 from subsequent bond proceeds or income derived from other sources	4,000,000

Public Health Department

\$2,630,000

Priority No. 3

The Public Health Program involves \$2,630,000. This does not include any major capital investment although considerable rehabilitation work has been requested for the City and County Hospital. The Committee recommends, therefore, that the Public Health requirements be included in annual budgets.

It has been suggested that instead of extending the present emergency hospital system by a construction program, the City should contract with private hospitals for the care of emergency cases in districts where emergency hospitals are not operated by the City at present. We recommend that the proper City officials be directed to study and report to the Mayor and Board of Supervisors on this proposal.

Water Department - San Joaquin Valley Pipeline

\$5,000,000

Priority No. 3

According to the San Francisco Water Department, installation of this line, costing approximately \$10,000,000, could, from an economic point of view, be laid in several sections. The first section, estimated to cost



\$5,000,000, involves about half of the line, extending from a connection with the present line at the San Joaquin River to the Tesla Portal. This would provide additional capacity of from 16 to 19 mgd. and is necessary to meet the rapidly increasing consumption. This additional capacity would provide for the next ten years, assuming estimated increase in system consumption is approximately correct. The second and third sections would be installed as required to provide ultimate additional capacity.

This Committee favors a second San Joaquin Valley Pipeline and recommends the authorization at \$10,000,000 general obligations bonds, payable from revenues of which \$5,000,000 should be sold as soon as authorized for construction of the first section.

Additional requirements of the Water Department, involving problems of supply and distribution within the City, should be financed out of revenues as required under the Charter. The Committee therefore is not concerning itself with these particular improvements. It is obvious, of course, that as the City grows, utilities must be expanded. Once again the Committee intends no slight to a department in giving such brief treatment to its presentation. We give it complete endorsement.

This Committee further recommends that a survey be made to determine the actual cost of water sold to consumers in and out of San Francisco. All consumers should pay their proper share of such cost.

Sewers

\$9,694,975

Priority No. 4

The Board of Public Works has submitted an estimate for their requirements of \$9,694,975, which is approved by this Committee, to be included in the budget.

Of this amount, \$7,470,000 is for the construction of a sewage treatment plant near the Embarcadero, at the foot of North Point, Bay, Francisco and Chestnut Streets. The Department states that at a later period an additional treatment plant will have to be constructed in the general neighborhood of Hunter's Point to take care of our easterly beaches.

the Commission has been established to study the  
present law of the subject and to make such  
recommendations as it may deem proper. The  
Commission is composed of the following members:  
The Commission is authorized to hold public  
hearings and to receive such evidence as it may  
deem proper.

The Commission is authorized to hold public  
hearings and to receive such evidence as it may  
deem proper. The Commission is authorized to  
hold public hearings and to receive such evidence  
as it may deem proper.

The Commission is authorized to hold public  
hearings and to receive such evidence as it may  
deem proper. The Commission is authorized to  
hold public hearings and to receive such evidence  
as it may deem proper.

The Commission is authorized to hold public  
hearings and to receive such evidence as it may  
deem proper. The Commission is authorized to  
hold public hearings and to receive such evidence  
as it may deem proper.

The Commission is authorized to hold public  
hearings and to receive such evidence as it may  
deem proper. The Commission is authorized to  
hold public hearings and to receive such evidence  
as it may deem proper.

The continual pollution of the Bay waters immediately adjacent to San Francisco not only is a hazard to public health but is rendering useless the beach facilities at the Aquatic Park Casino and also fouling other potential bathing areas in the Marina district further West. At this writing, it is generally expected that the State and possibly Federal authorities may enforce this development and certainly San Francisco would be in a much better position if it would do this job as soon as priority materials become available instead of eventually having to be ordered to do it. Another sewage treatment plant will have to be built subsequently, but conditions demand that the North Point treatment plant be built first. It serves an area of a daytime population of possibly more than 500,000 persons.

This Committee was prepared to recommend a general bond issue of \$7,470,000 for construction of the North Point Sewage Treatment Plant but refrained from doing so on the advice of Mr. Thomas A. Brooks, Chief Administrative Officer, who stated that in all probability funds for this construction would be forthcoming from either State or Federal sources.

The voters approved a \$12,000,000 bond issue last year for sewer improvements and extensions which, together with funds in hand, should complete the greater part of the sewage program, excepting the treatment plants.



Corporation Yard and Buildings  
(and Warehouse for Voting Machines)

\$1,185,000  
188,000  
\$1,373,000

Priority No. 4

For some years, we are advised, there has been a serious need for an improved layout of yards, offices and shops for the maintenance bureau of the Department of Public Works. Here are stored many expensive pieces of machinery used for road construction and repairs, as well as trucks, automobiles and other vehicles. Many of these today are stored in an open lot and deteriorate as they stand for months at a time when not being used. Mechanics working on these machines often must make their repairs outside in the rain because of inadequate shop space. These factors alone point to the urgency for additional buildings, but it will be necessary for the entire unit to be moved elsewhere, probably at an early date, because the Thirteenth Street Widening, which would connect the Waller Street development and the Bayshore Freeway and Mission Street developments, will require a portion of the present yard space. A yearly rental of \$5400 is being paid by the City now for storage of voting machines in a private warehouse, so the City is justified in erecting its own building for that purpose.

Urban Redevelopment

\$2,100,000

Priority No. 5

It is estimated that the direct recovery from the investment in Redevelopment Sites will be in the neighborhood of 75%. The shrinkage should be more than offset by the resultant increase in assessed property values.

Tideland Development

\$4,000,000

Priorities Nos. 6 and 22

The City Planning Commission reports that all the tidelands available for purchase consist of 91 acres North of Hunter's Point and 56 acres South of Hunter's Point, a total of 147 acres, which it estimates can be purchased for \$215,000, based on  $2\frac{1}{2}$  times the assessed valuation. In addition there would be a recovery of 51 acres in public streets North of Hunter's Point and 40 acres in public streets and channels South of Hunter's Point, a total of 91 acres. The over-all acreage thus redeveloped would be 238 acres. This is irrespective of some 30 acres of tidelands owned by the State of California.

11,000,000  
100,000  
11,100,000

Consolidation and the  
Federal Reserve Bank

Twenty No. 6

For the year, we are pleased to report that the business of the Federal Reserve Bank has been successful. The bank has been able to maintain its position as a leading financial institution in the United States. The bank has been able to provide the services of its members and the public in a satisfactory manner. The bank has been able to maintain its capital and surplus at a level which is sufficient to meet the needs of its members and the public. The bank has been able to maintain its position as a leading financial institution in the United States. The bank has been able to provide the services of its members and the public in a satisfactory manner. The bank has been able to maintain its capital and surplus at a level which is sufficient to meet the needs of its members and the public.

11,000,000

Consolidation and the

Twenty No. 6

It is estimated that the business of the Federal Reserve Bank has been successful. The bank has been able to maintain its position as a leading financial institution in the United States. The bank has been able to provide the services of its members and the public in a satisfactory manner. The bank has been able to maintain its capital and surplus at a level which is sufficient to meet the needs of its members and the public. The bank has been able to maintain its position as a leading financial institution in the United States. The bank has been able to provide the services of its members and the public in a satisfactory manner. The bank has been able to maintain its capital and surplus at a level which is sufficient to meet the needs of its members and the public.

11,000,000

Consolidation and the

Twenty No. 6

The Federal Reserve Bank has been successful in its business. The bank has been able to maintain its position as a leading financial institution in the United States. The bank has been able to provide the services of its members and the public in a satisfactory manner. The bank has been able to maintain its capital and surplus at a level which is sufficient to meet the needs of its members and the public. The bank has been able to maintain its position as a leading financial institution in the United States. The bank has been able to provide the services of its members and the public in a satisfactory manner. The bank has been able to maintain its capital and surplus at a level which is sufficient to meet the needs of its members and the public.

This Committee approves the project, to be financed by general bond issue, as follows:

Priority #6 for purchase of land	\$215,000
Priority #22 for fill, street work, etc.	\$3,785,000

There is some question whether the reclamation of tidelands can be effected at a cost which will permit resale of the property at relatively competitive prices. It is recommended that the City Planning Commission and the City Engineers make a further careful study and analysis of this matter before the bonds for fill and street work are offered for sale.

<u>Street Lighting</u>	\$4,309,300
Priority No. 7	

On the recommendation of Utilities Manager, E. G. Cahill, the Committee suggests that these improvements and extensions be cared for within the regular budgets. In line with established City policy, they would be made coincident with street improvements where possible. This program, with three exceptions, is composed of small items from \$70,000 down to \$4,300; the three exceptions being Mission Street from South Van Ness to the City limits, \$213,500; Geary Boulevard from Presidio Avenue to Forty-second Avenue, \$105,600; and Alemany Boulevard from Bayshore to Junipero Serra, \$99,000.

<u>Fire Department</u>	\$6,382,500
Priorities Nos. 7 and 15	

This Committee recommends the allocation of funds, as follows:

From annual budgets for repair of engine houses and construction of new engine houses	\$1,904,000
Priority #7 from proceeds of bond sales	2,578,500
Priority #15 from subsequent proceeds of bond sales or income derived from other sources	1,900,000

It is also recommended that the Mayor's policy of combining new police stations and engine houses to save the additional cost of separate properties and buildings should be continued.

THE COMMISSIONER OF THE GENERAL LAND OFFICE, LONDON.

1st January 1900.

Dear Sir,

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 28th inst.

and in reply to inform you that the same has been forwarded to the proper authorities for their consideration.

I am, Sir, very respectfully, your obedient servant,

Yours faithfully,

W. H. R. [Signature]

Enclosed for you are two copies of the report of the Committee on the subject of the proposed extension of the railway line from [place] to [place].

I am, Sir, very respectfully, your obedient servant,

Yours faithfully,

W. H. R. [Signature]

Enclosed for you are two copies of the report of the Committee on the subject of the proposed extension of the railway line from [place] to [place].

I am, Sir, very respectfully, your obedient servant,

Yours faithfully,

W. H. R. [Signature]

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 28th inst.

and in reply to inform you that the same has been forwarded to the proper authorities for their consideration.

I am, Sir, very respectfully, your obedient servant,

Yours faithfully,

W. H. R. [Signature]

Enclosed for you are two copies of the report of the Committee on the subject of the proposed extension of the railway line from [place] to [place].

W. H. R. [Signature]

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 28th inst.

and in reply to inform you that the same has been forwarded to the proper authorities for their consideration.

I am, Sir, very respectfully, your obedient servant,

Yours faithfully,

W. H. R. [Signature]

Enclosed for you are two copies of the report of the Committee on the subject of the proposed extension of the railway line from [place] to [place].

I am, Sir, very respectfully, your obedient servant,

Yours faithfully,

W. H. R. [Signature]

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 28th inst.

and in reply to inform you that the same has been forwarded to the proper authorities for their consideration.

I am, Sir, very respectfully, your obedient servant,

Police Department

\$3,142,000

Priorities Nos. 8 and 23

This Committee recommends the allocation of funds, as follows:

From annual budgets

\$697,000

Priority #8 from proceeds of bond sales, for  
Hall of Justice

\$2,095,000

Priority #23 from subsequent proceeds of bond  
sales or income derived from other sources,  
for Traffic Courts Building

\$350,000

The amount of \$44,000 has been included in the current budget for remodeling of the Potrero, Richmond, Southern and Golden Gate Park Stations. The balance of \$66,000 for repairing four other district stations and a \$7,000 item for a garage in the Golden Gate Park, and the \$15,000 for plans and \$235,000 for construction of a new police academy and training grounds by Lake Merced next to the Pistol Range should likewise be included in the budget.

The Department's two remaining items are \$2,095,000 for a new headquarters building which would be situated on Kearny Street, from Merchant Street to Clay Street, and \$350,000 for a Traffic Courts Building, probably on Gough Street, near Page Street. We are advised that the present Hall of Justice because of its extremely heavy construction would require an amount of money far out of proportion for the remodeling which would result and that Department facilities would not be adequate at the completion of that work. It is the Police Department's suggestion, and this Committee's recommendation, that funds be provided for a new headquarters building, on the site mentioned hereinabove, and a Traffic Bureau Building. This would make possible the sale of the present property which would reduce the over-all cost of these projects and provide a metropolitan police force with facilities commensurate with its importance in this seaport city.

Park Department

\$7,215,500

Priority No. 9

The Park Department has submitted an over-all program totaling \$12,017,500. This Committee recommends the allocation of \$7,215,500 as follows:

From annual budgets

\$3,715,000

Priority #9 from proceeds of bond sales

3,500,000

This Committee heartily favors an adequate Park system. It recognizes that because of insufficient budget appropriations the Park plant has deteriorated considerably in recent years. We urge generous budget appropriations hereafter.

The recommendations made by this Committee should start the Park Department well on its road of rehabilitation and construction, although we realize that there is more work to be done when this program is completed.

With reference to McLaren Park, the Committee believes that as soon as boundaries of this projected development are determined finally, efforts should be made to provide baseball fields, possibly swimming facilities and other recreational areas by which many residents in the southern part of the City can be accommodated.

1. The first group of people who are interested in the study of the history of the United States are the people who are interested in the history of the United States.

77 Nov. 8, 1952 11:14 AM 7.5

*Submitted: December 1987*

... 1123 ...

9. 2011. 12. 12.

... ..

Sixth-Seventh  
Freeway Extension

\$8,000,000

Priority No. 10

The construction of this project would in effect be a continuation of the proposed Sixth Street Viaduct and would be means of overpassing Market Street just west of Sixth and Taylor Streets, continuing into approximately Ellis and O'Farrell, where a major offstreet parking facility should be built.

In addition to providing an uninterrupted traffic artery into the mid-town area for private automobiles and trucks, this would also be a means whereby an express bus service from outlying districts could be operated.

Sixth Street Viaduct

\$5,000,000

Priority No. 11

Both from the standpoint of commuters who spend many of their dollars in San Francisco, and from the standpoint of our own residents, the situation in the Third and Townsend Street areas is today almost unbearable and will probably become worse when peacetime conditions bring additional automobiles on to the streets. With this thought in mind, the Committee recognizes the importance of constructing a viaduct across the Southern Pacific yards at a point approximately at Sixth Street, commencing approximately at Brannan Street, and connecting with the Third Street Boulevard approximately at 17th Street.

This would eliminate many of the traffic jams caused by trains blocking traffic at Third Street and at other crossings within the railroad yards proper, and also would provide an effective by-pass for the Channel Street Bridge which is raised several times daily to permit the passage of vessels in the Third Street channel.

Construction of this viaduct would mean a concrete saving of many thousands of dollars to San Franciscans because of time which would be saved to individuals and in the hauling of merchandise. Under present conditions, literally scores of passenger automobiles and trucks are delayed long periods of time day in and out because of blockades of traffic from the warehouse and industrial districts. Without having obtained actual figures, the Committee is convinced that the savings in drayage costs would be sufficient to justify some reduction in the cost of consumer goods, and thereby result in a direct saving in over-the-counter prices to San Francisco and Bay Area shoppers.



Division and 13th Streets  
Separation of Grades

\$6,000,000

Priority No. 12

We are informed that the State Highway Commission has practically decided to construct the Bayshore Freeway at a cost of \$26,000,000 running from 7th Street, curving between Bryant and Harrison on a line through the Potrero District east of the San Francisco Hospital to the County Line. This will provide high-speed access to the Bay Bridge and central business district. The separation of grades on Division and 13th Streets should be done at the same time this Freeway is constructed. This grade separation would be important because it would also feed 10th Street.

Broadway Tunnel

\$3,200,000

Priority No. 14

Construction of a tunnel on Broadway Street, from the present westerly terminus of the street in the North Beach District at Mason Street, to a point on the Western side of Russian Hill, between Larkin and Hyde Streets, would provide an important connection and faster flow of traffic between the Marina, Richmond, Northern and Western Addition areas, and the downtown district where so many of these residents either work or shop. It also would serve to ease traffic congestion in the North Beach district.

It is also recommended that both ends of the Broadway Tunnel be constructed so that the whole will constitute a fitting war memorial for those who served in the Armed Forces of the United States in World War II.

Civic Auditorium Remodeling

\$445,000

Priority #16

The Committee has had various requests, principally from the San Francisco Convention and Tourist Bureau, urging the construction of a new auditorium large enough to accommodate conventions attracting 25,000 delegates in normal years and providing maximum exhibit space for trade shows and similar events. A discussion of these proposals is contained later in this report.

The present Civic Auditorium will seat a maximum crowd of about 7,200. It was constructed in 1915 and the Committee is advised that the shell of the building is in excellent shape. The building interior, however, has shown its years of constant use and the main auditorium is poor from an acoustical standpoint.



The Committee has a recommendation from the City Art Commission that \$445,000 be expended for the complete remodeling of the auditorium's interior so that it will seat probably 9,500 persons and also have improved accoustical qualities. Whether it would be practical to recommend this improvement and at the same time give consideration to any construction of a new auditorium within the next ten years is questionable. This Committee, therefore, recommends that a decision on the latter project, as important as it may be to the business and cultural interests of the City, be deferred until the general situation can be determined more clearly. In the meantime, we recommend remodeling of the present auditorium.

Public Library \$1,206,800  
Priority No. 17

This Committee recommends the allocation of funds as follows:

From annual budgets	501,800
Priority #18, addition to Main Public Library	705,000

It is recommended that the cost of all extensions of the library system be included in annual budgets with the exception of the addition to the main Public Library.

In line with the policy of including other items in the budget, there is in the current municipal budget \$120,000 for the construction of branch libraries in the Marina and North Beach districts.

Courts Building, City Hall Alterations and  
Civic Center Power House Development \$6,409,000  
Priority No. 18

This recommendation involves the following improvements:

Civil Courts Building	5,350,000
City Hall Alterations	904,000
Addition to Civic Center	
Power House	155,000

Completion of the Civic Center Building program by the erection of a Courts Building on Larkin Street on the City owned site presently occupied by the Hospitality House would serve the dual purposes of making possible the proper grouping of City and County offices and providing a material addition to the appearance of the City.



By constructing this building it would be possible to have in one structure the Courts, County Clerk's Office, County Recorder's Office, Law Library, City Attorney, Sheriff and the Public Administrator. A shifting of these offices, most of which are now in the City Hall, would make possible the inclusion within the City Hall of many auxiliary offices of City departments for which \$43,045 tax monies are spent annually for space rented in various buildings about the City. This in turn would provide for more orderly arrangement of offices, allow for the expansion of some departments such as the Assessor and Controller (which are particular examples of cramped quarters) and in general add to the efficiency of departmental operations.

The Committee heard testimony from Messrs. Arthur Brown, John Bakewell and Frederick Meyer who were architects for City owned and other municipal buildings to the effect that the City Hall as originally planned was never meant to include courts but only regular business offices.

In the completion of the Civic Center program there also is the corner of McAllister and Polk Streets where a gasoline service station presently is situated on City owned property. This property originally was purchased as the site for a Fire Department Headquarters Building.

Municipal Garage

\$600,000

Priority No. 19

From time to time there have been discussions of the possible construction of a municipal garage where municipally owned automobiles could be stored and serviced in the immediate Civic Center area. The construction of a subterranean garage similar to Union Square in Civic Center has been mentioned; also the placing of garage facilities beneath the Commerce High School Athletic Field. Another suggestion is for the inclusion of sub-basements in the proposed Courts Building to house City automobiles. The Committee believes that this subject requires additional study because of the various suggestions and also because numerous civic employees must take City owned automobiles home at night and on week ends for stand-by service in the event of utility disruption and for other reasons. There is no doubt that this subject has merit but the Committee would like to see full and proper study made before arriving at any commitments. No definite estimates have been made as to the cost of a municipal garage, but based on statements made by officials of the Board of Public Works, we have projected it arbitrarily at \$600,000.



County Jails

\$587,500

Priority No. 20

This recommendation involves additions to cell blocks involving expenditures of \$137,500 in County Jail #1, and \$450,000 in County Jail #2, which the sheriff states are necessary to the proper conduct of his department.

Museums

\$1,174,624

Priority No. 21

The De Young Museum has submitted a budget of \$1,095,724, and the Legion of Honor \$78,900.

This Committee recommends the financing of these projects as follows:

From annual budgets       \$332,874

Priority #22 from  
proceeds of bond sales   \$841,750

This Committee is of the opinion that the emphasis which San Francisco has placed on its cultural activities should be continued and that as soon as urgent projects involving practical living are disposed of, capital improvements for cultural programs should be provided. However, there are many small items which the Committee believes could be included within the regular budgets from year to year, thereby caring for phases of these cultural activities without unnecessary delays.

Triangle of Land Civic Center

Estimated \$1,065,000

Priority #24

This triangle of land is bounded by Hyde, Fulton and Market Streets. It was originally intended that the improvements in this section facing the Civic Center should be made to conform with the general architectural features of the Center. In acquiring this land it is recommended that only those parts facing the Center and necessary for architectural harmony should be retained by the City. The rest should be continued as private business property and the continuity of business facing on Market Street should not be disturbed.



THIS COMMITTEE ENDORSES THE FOLLOWING  
PROJECTS WHICH DO NOT REQUIRE FINANCING  
BY THE CITY OF SAN FRANCISCO

PUBLIC HOUSING

The San Francisco Housing Authority has a projected budget of \$5,500,000 most of which is scheduled for construction in the first postwar year. This Committee endorses the program. It was not called on and is not prepared to pass on its adequacy.

There is a great need for adequate housing in San Francisco for low income groups which, if not supplied by private capital, should be constructed with public funds.

This Committee has not included the San Francisco Housing Authority's Program in the foregoing recommendations involving bond issues or revenue measures, because it is financed entirely from Federal funds.

WORLD TRADE CENTER

This is a venture of first magnitude to San Francisco, involving an investment of approximately \$35,000,000. It is in the capable hands of a body of public-spirited citizens who have incorporated and propose to finance it with private capital. There will be no call for public funds so it is not included in the foregoing financial program. It has unqualified endorsement of this Committee and requires and is deserving of the united support of the community.

We suggest that consideration be given to the inclusion of the proposed Exposition Building and Civic Auditorium in the World Trade Center Program.

PRODUCE MARKET

The City Planning Commission recommended \$500,000 for the acquisition of land for a new produce market. Merchants and property owners in the present produce district have formed an organization and have projected plans for an adequate produce terminal. As long as there is assurance that this necessary improvement will be carried out with private capital we do not recommend the use of public funds for the purpose. For this reason the Committee has not included it in the foregoing financial budget.



CENTRAL PASSENGER TERMINAL FOR RAILROADS  
AND POSSIBLY OTHER FORMS OF TRANSPORTATION

The existing condition of scattered, and in some instances wholly inadequate railroad and bus terminals should be remedied at the earliest possible moment. In our opinion, the over-all traffic and transit problem will not be solved by the fulfillment of the program recommended by this Committee unless a central passenger terminal is included.

It should be located to permit quick and easy flow of travel between outlying areas and the destinations of the greatest number of travelers. The location and means of access to and from this terminal should be articulated with the general over-all transit plan envisioned in this report.

In the erection of its Union Terminal, Los Angeles is a notable example of the value of a properly located and commodious central terminal. Prior to its erection, there was considerable confusion in travel, and criticism by residents and travelers. Since then the situation has been alleviated and is subject to much favorable comment.

This Committee recommends that the Mayor immediately take steps to insure the construction of an adequate Central Passenger Terminal.

SUNDRY

(1) There are several other projects recommended by the City Planning Commission which, in the opinion of this Committee, deserve prompt attention. They do not involve capital expenditures and therefore were not included in our financial recommendations. We do recommend that they be provided for in the next annual budget. They are:

War Memorial - Repair Work      \$145,000

Public Welfare Commission      40,000

(2) We think it important that the several departments of the City Government should provide out of their budgets, the necessary funds to accomplish certain relatively simple but desirable improvements. Among them are:

The inauguration of a tree planting program

The improvement of the easterly end of Yacht Harbor  
(Gas House Cove)

Kirkland Yard Hold

(3) For the purpose of conserving land hereafter, consideration should be given to building playgrounds over new reservoirs and over old ones capable of carrying a live load. The Park, Recreation and School Departments should work cooperatively to provide more general use of all recreational facilities, including swimming pools, and to avoid unnecessary duplication of such facilities.

The existing condition of the facility and its associated wholly independent facilities and its equipment should be reviewed at the earliest possible moment. It is recommended that the overall facility and its equipment be reviewed by the Director of the program recommended by this Committee unless a central committee is established.

It should be noted that the facility is located in a remote area of the country and is not accessible to the public. The location and the facilities of the program should be reviewed at the earliest possible moment. It is recommended that the facility be reviewed by the Director of the program recommended by this Committee unless a central committee is established.

In the event that the facility is not reviewed at the earliest possible moment, it is recommended that the facility be reviewed by the Director of the program recommended by this Committee unless a central committee is established. It is recommended that the facility be reviewed by the Director of the program recommended by this Committee unless a central committee is established.

It is recommended that the facility be reviewed by the Director of the program recommended by this Committee unless a central committee is established. It is recommended that the facility be reviewed by the Director of the program recommended by this Committee unless a central committee is established.

It is recommended that the facility be reviewed by the Director of the program recommended by this Committee unless a central committee is established. It is recommended that the facility be reviewed by the Director of the program recommended by this Committee unless a central committee is established.

It is recommended that the facility be reviewed by the Director of the program recommended by this Committee unless a central committee is established. It is recommended that the facility be reviewed by the Director of the program recommended by this Committee unless a central committee is established.

It is recommended that the facility be reviewed by the Director of the program recommended by this Committee unless a central committee is established. It is recommended that the facility be reviewed by the Director of the program recommended by this Committee unless a central committee is established.

It is recommended that the facility be reviewed by the Director of the program recommended by this Committee unless a central committee is established. It is recommended that the facility be reviewed by the Director of the program recommended by this Committee unless a central committee is established.

It is recommended that the facility be reviewed by the Director of the program recommended by this Committee unless a central committee is established. It is recommended that the facility be reviewed by the Director of the program recommended by this Committee unless a central committee is established.

RECOMMENDED FOR FURTHER STUDY

PROJECTS WHICH CAN BE FINANCED  
BY STATE OR PRIVATE FUNDS

This Committee recommends thorough study of the following projects which could be financed by State or Private funds.

1.- DIVISIONAL HIGHWAY

A divisional highway across San Francisco from north to south paralleling Scott and Divisadero Streets.

2.- CALIFORNIA ACADEMY OF SCIENCES

This Committee is informed by Mr. Norman B. Livermore, President of the Board of Trustees, California Academy of Sciences, that that organization has on hand about \$500,000, various sums of which are ear-marked for application solely to the following projects to be constructed in Golden Gate Park:

1. Auditorium
2. Extension to African Exhibit Hall
3. Extension to Herbarium
4. Extension to Library
5. Planetarium

\$250,000 of the sum on hand is set aside for the Planetarium, which we believe would be a great asset in the educational life of the community.

The California Academy of Sciences is licensed by the State of California and under its charter makes an annual report to the Governor. The organization is desirous of having the afore-mentioned building projects participate in funds which the State has set aside or will set aside for post-war projects.

The Academy cannot directly participate in these State funds. However, we are informed that the State authorities have intimated that if a joint request is made by the City of San Francisco and the Academy, it might receive favorable consideration for an appropriation of approximately \$500,000.

In the opinion of this Committee, the projects hereinbefore listed, and particularly the Planetarium, have considerable merit. Planetariums in New York, Chicago and Los Angeles have been centers of great interest with the public and the attendance has been large.

If the project is approved, the State would furnish the additional funds, but the City of San Francisco would cooperate in the application and furnish a site for the buildings adjacent to the present Academy buildings in Golden Gate Park.

This Committee recommends that the proper City officials explore this proposal promptly with the view to determining whether or not it is to the benefit of the City to include this \$500,000 item in the application to be made by this City for State participation in postwar City and County construction.

1. The first step is to identify the problem or question that needs to be answered. This involves understanding the context and the specific requirements of the task.

1990

New Auditorium and Exhibit Halls

\$8,000,000 to \$10,000,000

While the Committee has received a strong recommendation in favor of the construction of a new auditorium to seat 20,000 to 25,000, together with adequate exhibit halls, it has no factual data upon which to base an accurate estimate of its probable cost. Spokesmen for the project have stressed the fact that the convention business is an important one to any city and that convention delegates bring new money into a community and thereby add to its prosperity. The Committee agrees with this logic but at the same time feels that other improvements are of more immediate vital concern to San Francisco. In making this assertion, we realize that changing conditions may influence this judgment as time goes on. There is, for example, a private project, the World Trade Center, in the making. It is getting serious attention from a group of progressive local citizens who estimate its cost at \$35,000,000. As this World Trade Center plan is developed, it might be practical business for the City to invest a sizable sum in a new auditorium which would comprise one of the buildings in the World Trade Center group.



### GENERAL COMMENTS

#### Bayshore Freeway

\$26,000,000

The construction of this Freeway has been authorized by the State Highway Commission. It will be State financed with partial assistance of State gas tax refunds to the City.

#### Reber Plan

The Committee gave consideration to the Reber Plan which is of tremendous scope and challenges the imagination. However, as it involves other municipalities as well as the State and Federal Governments, this Committee does not consider it within its province to make any recommendation in relation to it. It is a matter for consideration by representatives of the communities it would affect.

### CONCLUSION

This Committee recognizes that there is nothing static about San Francisco and that its need for improved facilities will be continuing. If the recommendations contained in this report are adopted and the so-called Master Plan eventually completed, the growth of the City will require further planning and construction. Some additional projects, such as completion of the Marginal Freeway to encircle the City, are already obvious. We are not attempting to recommend a plan that will suffice for all time, but we feel that the recommendations contained in this report will go a long way toward fitting San Francisco to meet its most pressing needs for years to come.

GENERAL PRINCIPLES

1902, 1903, 1904

1902, 1903, 1904

The construction of this highway has been authorized by the State Highway Law. It will be built under the provisions of the State Highway Law. It will be built under the provisions of the State Highway Law. It will be built under the provisions of the State Highway Law.

1902, 1903, 1904

The Committee has been authorized to the State Highway Law. It will be built under the provisions of the State Highway Law. It will be built under the provisions of the State Highway Law. It will be built under the provisions of the State Highway Law. It will be built under the provisions of the State Highway Law.

GENERAL PRINCIPLES

THE Committee has been authorized to the State Highway Law. It will be built under the provisions of the State Highway Law. It will be built under the provisions of the State Highway Law. It will be built under the provisions of the State Highway Law. It will be built under the provisions of the State Highway Law.

COPY

MINORITY REPORT TO MAYOR'S POST WAR PLANNING COMMITTEE

SUBMITTED BY CHESTER R. MACPHEE

The increasing use of our public streets and boulevards by the automobile and truck since the advent of the automotive age has added cost upon cost to the property tax payer. This is reflected in maintenance costs and extensions far beyond the subventions received from gasoline tax funds by the City and County of San Francisco. This is particularly true of the increased costs resulting from our boulevard lighting, traffic control, emergency hospital service, Police Department, Department of Electricity and others. Assessed valuations on real property have also been affected as a result of street widening and extensions. A notable example of this is in connection with the new Bayshore Freeway which will remove from the assessment roll some \$6,000,000.00 in assessed valuations.

Included in the recommendations of the Mayor's Post War Planning Committee for major street improvements are amounts in excess of \$40,000,000.00 (exclusive of street railway rehabilitation). In appearing before the Post War Committee, the Chief Administrative Officer of the City and County of San Francisco advised that existing and anticipated gas tax funds are only sufficient to care for normal street work maintenance and repairs. Therefore, the expenditure of some \$40,000,000.00 for the proposed street improvement program must be paid from taxes imposed on real and personal property tax payers.

If we subscribe to the theory that a public utility should be operated for the benefit of the people and should not provide a monetary profit or loss to the taxpayer, we can as well expect the major street improvements to be paid for at least, in a large measure by those who will receive the greatest benefits therefrom. This, of course, is the automobile and truck user. An increase of .01¢ in the gasoline tax collected in San Francisco and retained in its entirety for street repairs and extensions is a common sense way to pay for this needed work. San Francisco should not attempt to do this alone but should join forces with and provide the leadership in effectuating such a program throughout the eight counties of the Bay Area. These other eight counties have almost the same problem as do we, and it is my belief that these counties will respond to such a program if properly and intelligently presented.

Respectfully submitted,

Chester R. MacPhee (signed)  
Chester R. MacPhee

REPORT OF THE COMMISSIONER OF THE GENERAL LAND OFFICE

FOR THE YEAR 1900

The following is a summary of the work done by the General Land Office during the year 1900. The work was done in accordance with the plan of work approved by the Board of Commissioners on January 1, 1900. The work was done in accordance with the plan of work approved by the Board of Commissioners on January 1, 1900. The work was done in accordance with the plan of work approved by the Board of Commissioners on January 1, 1900.

The work was done in accordance with the plan of work approved by the Board of Commissioners on January 1, 1900. The work was done in accordance with the plan of work approved by the Board of Commissioners on January 1, 1900. The work was done in accordance with the plan of work approved by the Board of Commissioners on January 1, 1900.

The work was done in accordance with the plan of work approved by the Board of Commissioners on January 1, 1900. The work was done in accordance with the plan of work approved by the Board of Commissioners on January 1, 1900. The work was done in accordance with the plan of work approved by the Board of Commissioners on January 1, 1900.

The work was done in accordance with the plan of work approved by the Board of Commissioners on January 1, 1900. The work was done in accordance with the plan of work approved by the Board of Commissioners on January 1, 1900. The work was done in accordance with the plan of work approved by the Board of Commissioners on January 1, 1900.

August 16, 1945

Honorable Roger D. Lapham, Mayor  
Room 200, City Hall  
San Francisco 2, California

My dear Mr. Mayor:

Minority Report of the Citizens' Postwar  
Planning Committee

The undersigned members of the Citizens' Post War Planning Committee appointed by you on April 5, 1945 pursuant to a resolution of the Board of Supervisors, herewith submits a minority report of the undersigned members dissenting from the opinions and findings expressed in the majority report.

It is the opinion of those members of your committee who are making this minority report that the projects suggested in the majority report are, in the main, projects which are helpful to the area surrounding the City and County of San Francisco, as well as advantageous to the citizens of the City and County of San Francisco. The tax burden, however, suggested to be imposed by the majority committee report requires the citizens of San Francisco to bear completely the tax burden of these advantages which would have the effect of benefiting the residents of wealthy suburban communities at the expense of those districts in San Francisco in which people in lower income brackets reside. If a broader tax base is sought, it should be created by geographical expansion rather than increasing the tax load upon the bona fide residents of the City and County of San Francisco. The projects themselves suggested by this committee, while worthy, suggest an immediate viewpoint rather than a viewpoint over a period of time in keeping with the ability of San Francisco citizens to pay for these suggested projects without occasioning unfavorable tax rates assessed in this city in comparison to nearby communities.

In particular, the members forwarding to you for submission this minority report are in opposition to the proposed tax program suggested by the majority members of the committee as outlined in the majority report on pages 18,19 and following pages. We are particularly opposed to the so-called amusement tax suggested by the majority report. The burden of this proposed tax would fall upon the motion picture theatres in San Francisco. The motion picture theatres in the City and County of San Francisco are owned and operated primarily by residents of San Francisco and the great percentage of the theatres are owned by the operators and exhibitors who operate the theatres as their source of livelihood. We respectfully submit that to assess an amusement tax in San Francisco would be an act of gross discrimination against one type of business.

At the present time, motion picture theatres in San Francisco pay a license tax based upon their business capacity. They are the only business in San Francisco which is paying any license tax whatsoever.

This additional tax is not levied at the theatres primarily, but is leveled at persons seeking low-cost amusement. It is suggested by the majority report that this tax is a luxury tax. If the tax is a luxury tax, patterned, as the majority report indicates, after the Federal luxury tax, to be logical it should cover all amusements and all luxuries of all kinds, not merely theatre and movie tickets. In other words, business such as night clubs, restaurants, dance rooms at hotels, furs, jewelry, perfumes, and all other items classified in the Federal luxury tax should be likewise included in this tax. We do not urge such municipal taxation but urge that if it be adopted all business bear a per capita tax on their customers and not limit the "customer tax" to theatres. We submit that it is patently unfair to seek to tax a family form of amusement and to leave unscathed by municipal taxation night clubs and hotel dancing resorts which are patronized by persons in the higher income brackets who have the funds at hand to expend in such a fashion.

Received of the Treasurer of the  
City of New York  
the sum of \$100.00  
for the year 1900

Statement of the Treasurer of the City of New York  
for the year 1900

The following statement shows the receipts and disbursements of the Treasurer of the City of New York for the year 1900. The receipts are shown in the first column and the disbursements in the second column. The balance forward from the previous year is shown in the third column. The total receipts are \$1,000,000.00, the total disbursements are \$950,000.00, and the balance forward is \$50,000.00. The total balance for the year is \$100,000.00.

Receipts	Disbursements	Balance Forward
\$1,000,000.00	\$950,000.00	\$50,000.00
		\$100,000.00

In this sense, this tax is discriminatory on the poor man and leaves the rich man untaxed in this field.

Secondly, we submit that it is to be remembered that the theatrical business is one which suffers severely in times of depression and thus the anticipated revenue from this form of taxation may fall far below the optimistic estimates suggested in the majority report. These estimates have been made by members of the committee who have had no experience of any kind in theatrical business.

In the decade from 1930 to 1940, the Tivoli Theatre was not opened at all, the Alcazar Theatre was rarely opened, the Hippodrome on O'Farrell Street and the Orpheum on O'Farrell Street and the Columbia on Ellis Street, all at one time first-class theatres, were torn down because of lack of patronage and because the owners of those premises did not deem it advisable to pay the taxes upon the structures built upon the property. In the light of this historical record, we believe the amusement tax would unduly burden an already taxed industry and not bring the financial benefits claimed for it.

Thirdly, the tax is particularly discriminatory upon the theatrical industry in that it requires the theatre industry to pay, by the figures submitted through the majority report, 25.6% of the total amount to be raised to finance new improvements in San Francisco and asks all of the other business enterprises in San Francisco to contribute only a like percentage. The 25,000-odd businesses in San Francisco have to pay for the privilege of doing business in San Francisco only as much as 70 motion picture houses are required to pay for the privilege of doing business in San Francisco.

It is further to be noted that other cities who have adopted this type of taxation have made it solely a war measure to end at the conclusion of the war. In other smaller California cities where a similar tax has been enacted, such as Richmond, the citizens on referendum rejected the tax.

Fourthly, both the American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organization have considered this proposed amusement tax both in San Francisco and in other communities, and both great labor organizations have opposed this type of taxation as being levied on the poor and working man.

The undersigned members of your committee ask your earnest consideration of the discriminatory nature of the proposed amusement tax, its unpopularity, and the inherent danger in singling out a specific industry or business to bear a lion's share of local taxation, and respectfully ask that, before the majority report is accepted by you, a further study be made by you on this matter.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ W. J. Nasser

/s/ Richard Spier

The first part of the report is devoted to a general survey of the situation in the country.

The second part of the report is devoted to a detailed study of the various aspects of the situation.

The third part of the report is devoted to a study of the various aspects of the situation.

The fourth part of the report is devoted to a study of the various aspects of the situation.

The fifth part of the report is devoted to a study of the various aspects of the situation.

The sixth part of the report is devoted to a study of the various aspects of the situation.

The seventh part of the report is devoted to a study of the various aspects of the situation.

The eighth part of the report is devoted to a study of the various aspects of the situation.

The ninth part of the report is devoted to a study of the various aspects of the situation.

The tenth part of the report is devoted to a study of the various aspects of the situation.

The eleventh part of the report is devoted to a study of the various aspects of the situation.

The twelfth part of the report is devoted to a study of the various aspects of the situation.

August 17, 1945

Honorable Roger D. Lapham  
Room 200, City Hall  
San Francisco, California

Dear Mr. Mayor:

As a member of the Citizens' Post-War Planning Committee appointed by you on April 5, 1945, I am, with great reluctance, forced to dissent from the recommendations of the Committee on two items. I do this only because I feel that these items are of extreme importance. In doing so, I wish to pay tribute to the other members of the Committee for their complete fairness and willingness to compromise. I have tried to approach the many problems which faced the Committee in the same spirit.

The first item with which I disagree appears on page 14 of the Committee's report. It is recommended that the amount of \$215,000 for the purchase of land for the Tidelands Development project be placed in priority #6. With this recommendation I am in complete accord. I feel, however, that the amount of \$3,785,000 to complete the project which is being recommended as priority #22 should also be contained in priority #6. It is my feeling that the development of land for industrial sites is of major importance to the City and County of San Francisco. As you know, our geographical area is extremely limited. It wouldn't be of very great value to purchase the tidelands without making provision for their reclamation and use. In my opinion, San Francisco must be in a position to provide suitable sites for industrial development.

The other item upon which I find myself in disagreement appears on page 19 of the report. The Committee makes certain recommendations to raise the necessary funds for the debt service charges and retirement of the bond issue which is being recommended. It is my opinion that in the field of taxation, municipalities are pretty definitely limited to general property taxation as a source of revenue. Sales and excise taxes, as well as consumer taxes generally, are the main source of revenue of our State Government and an important part of our Federal tax.

While this is my general feeling on the subject, in a spirit of compromise I concur in all of the Committee's recommendations on taxes with the exception of the proposed 2 $\frac{1}{2}$ % amusement tax. With respect to this proposal I call to your attention the fact that there is already a heavy Federal tax on amusements. An additional tax would fall most heavily on workers and people in the low income groups who are least able to pay additional taxes. The main source of relaxation of these groups is an occasional movie for themselves and their families. I believe that the amount proposed to be raised by this tax should be transferred to an additional real estate tax. I call your attention further to the fact that workers constitute the largest number of real estate tax payers in this community, but in my opinion they would be more willing to pay increased real estate taxes than they would be to pay an amusement tax.

With these two exceptions I concur in all of the other recommendations of the Committee.

Sincerely yours,

/s/ W. J. Phillips

RECEIVED  
JAN 10 1964  
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE  
WASHINGTON, D.C.

The following information was received from the Bureau of Plant Industry, U.S. Department of Agriculture, on January 10, 1964, regarding the results of the survey of the distribution of the pest, the cotton bollworm, in the State of Texas. The survey was conducted by the Texas Agricultural Experiment Station, and the results are summarized in the following table:

County	Number of Bollworms
Adair	1
Anderson	2
Angelina	3
Aransas	4
Armstrong	5
Brewster	6
Brewster	7
Brewster	8
Brewster	9
Brewster	10
Brewster	11
Brewster	12
Brewster	13
Brewster	14
Brewster	15
Brewster	16
Brewster	17
Brewster	18
Brewster	19
Brewster	20
Brewster	21
Brewster	22
Brewster	23
Brewster	24
Brewster	25
Brewster	26
Brewster	27
Brewster	28
Brewster	29
Brewster	30
Brewster	31
Brewster	32
Brewster	33
Brewster	34
Brewster	35
Brewster	36
Brewster	37
Brewster	38
Brewster	39
Brewster	40
Brewster	41
Brewster	42
Brewster	43
Brewster	44
Brewster	45
Brewster	46
Brewster	47
Brewster	48
Brewster	49
Brewster	50
Brewster	51
Brewster	52
Brewster	53
Brewster	54
Brewster	55
Brewster	56
Brewster	57
Brewster	58
Brewster	59
Brewster	60
Brewster	61
Brewster	62
Brewster	63
Brewster	64
Brewster	65
Brewster	66
Brewster	67
Brewster	68
Brewster	69
Brewster	70
Brewster	71
Brewster	72
Brewster	73
Brewster	74
Brewster	75
Brewster	76
Brewster	77
Brewster	78
Brewster	79
Brewster	80
Brewster	81
Brewster	82
Brewster	83
Brewster	84
Brewster	85
Brewster	86
Brewster	87
Brewster	88
Brewster	89
Brewster	90
Brewster	91
Brewster	92
Brewster	93
Brewster	94
Brewster	95
Brewster	96
Brewster	97
Brewster	98
Brewster	99
Brewster	100

The following information was received from the Bureau of Plant Industry, U.S. Department of Agriculture, on January 10, 1964, regarding the results of the survey of the distribution of the pest, the cotton bollworm, in the State of Texas. The survey was conducted by the Texas Agricultural Experiment Station, and the results are summarized in the following table:

County	Number of Bollworms
Adair	1
Anderson	2
Angelina	3
Aransas	4
Armstrong	5
Brewster	6
Brewster	7
Brewster	8
Brewster	9
Brewster	10
Brewster	11
Brewster	12
Brewster	13
Brewster	14
Brewster	15
Brewster	16
Brewster	17
Brewster	18
Brewster	19
Brewster	20
Brewster	21
Brewster	22
Brewster	23
Brewster	24
Brewster	25
Brewster	26
Brewster	27
Brewster	28
Brewster	29
Brewster	30
Brewster	31
Brewster	32
Brewster	33
Brewster	34
Brewster	35
Brewster	36
Brewster	37
Brewster	38
Brewster	39
Brewster	40
Brewster	41
Brewster	42
Brewster	43
Brewster	44
Brewster	45
Brewster	46
Brewster	47
Brewster	48
Brewster	49
Brewster	50
Brewster	51
Brewster	52
Brewster	53
Brewster	54
Brewster	55
Brewster	56
Brewster	57
Brewster	58
Brewster	59
Brewster	60
Brewster	61
Brewster	62
Brewster	63
Brewster	64
Brewster	65
Brewster	66
Brewster	67
Brewster	68
Brewster	69
Brewster	70
Brewster	71
Brewster	72
Brewster	73
Brewster	74
Brewster	75
Brewster	76
Brewster	77
Brewster	78
Brewster	79
Brewster	80
Brewster	81
Brewster	82
Brewster	83
Brewster	84
Brewster	85
Brewster	86
Brewster	87
Brewster	88
Brewster	89
Brewster	90
Brewster	91
Brewster	92
Brewster	93
Brewster	94
Brewster	95
Brewster	96
Brewster	97
Brewster	98
Brewster	99
Brewster	100

The following information was received from the Bureau of Plant Industry, U.S. Department of Agriculture, on January 10, 1964, regarding the results of the survey of the distribution of the pest, the cotton bollworm, in the State of Texas. The survey was conducted by the Texas Agricultural Experiment Station, and the results are summarized in the following table:

The following information was received from the Bureau of Plant Industry, U.S. Department of Agriculture, on January 10, 1964, regarding the results of the survey of the distribution of the pest, the cotton bollworm, in the State of Texas. The survey was conducted by the Texas Agricultural Experiment Station, and the results are summarized in the following table:

August 20, 1945

Adrien J. Falk, Chairman  
Citizens' Post War Planning Committee  
City Hall  
San Francisco, California

Preparedness for the unemployed requires listing and financing of Post War Projects.

Two factors are involved:

1. Unemployed.
2. Taxpayers.

Projects totaling \$70,000,000 are proposed by the Post War Committee appointed by the Mayor and requires financing by general bond issue. The Mayor's instructions to the Committee:

"It is my desire that you aid the Commission in the development of a practical and economically sound Post War improvement projects."

Increasing the taxpayers burden by a substantial amount is not economically sound.

The Public Utility Commission informed the Committee:

"Net income from the San Francisco Air Port (when operating) is estimated by the Public Utility Commission at \$7,157,552, for the first fifteen years."

For the first fifteen years the Public Utilities Commission has not taken into account the amount of interest, bond redemption and San Mateo taxes that must be paid. As a matter of fact, at the end of the third year of Air Port operation, the Air Port operating deficit will be approximately \$1,000,000

FOLLOWING IMPORTANT STATEMENT BY SUB COMMITTEE.

"The interest requirement, plus principal repayments of the \$70,000,000 bond issue would (at today's levels) be around \$3,600,000 annually, equivalent to 43¢ in the tax rate. The sub-committee believes that the general property tax payer is already bearing a disproportionate share of the cost of local government."

In order to lighten the taxpayers burden, the Committee decided upon the following allocations:

Additional business licenses	\$1,000,000 annually
2½¢ Amusement Tax	\$1,000,000 "
Hetch Hetchy Assumption	\$600,000 "
Taxes on real estate	\$1,300,000 "

The real estate tax amounts to 17½¢ approximately, in the tax rate.

THE  
OFFICE OF THE  
ATTORNEY GENERAL

MEMORANDUM FOR THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

RE: [Illegible]

DATE: [Illegible]

TO: [Illegible]

FROM: [Illegible]

[Illegible]

[Illegible]

[Illegible]

[Illegible]

[Illegible]

[Illegible]

[Illegible]

[Illegible]

[Illegible]

[Illegible]

[Illegible]

[Illegible]

[Illegible]

[Illegible]

[Illegible]

[Illegible]

[Illegible]

[Illegible]

[Illegible]

[Illegible]

[Illegible]

[Illegible]

[Illegible]

[Illegible]

[Illegible]

[Illegible]

[Illegible]

[Illegible]

[Illegible]

Many worthwhile projects have been listed. In my opinion, the Committee made a wise decision in the making of major streets No. 1 Priority, \$17,544,000. Included in said amount is \$3,500,000 for street car thoroughfares. As soon as the Public Utility Commission accumulates the funds covering the railway portion of the work, same will provide a large amount of labor.

The proposed \$3,000,000 for study, engineering and working plans SMIRKS OF A SUBWAY SCHEME, objected to: there being no necessity for "engineering study and working plans" on Market Street surface traffic involving \$3,000,000.

The following items should be eliminated, not being necessary at this time:

Street lighting-from Annual Budgets	\$4,309,300
Sixth Street Viaduct-Bond Issue	\$5,000,000
Motor Terminals-General Bond Issue	\$3,000,000
Traffic Signals	\$ 500,000

Table No. 1 shows that the Committee has approved projects totaling \$177,450,040 as follows:

Inclusion in Annual Budgets	\$ 41,829,164
Revenue producing (pay-as-you-go).	\$ 33,331,126
To be financed by general Bond Issue and funds derived from other sources	<u>\$102,293,750</u>
Total	\$177,450,040

The above covers a six year plan.

Passage of a general Bond Issue requires a two thirds vote. If, as might be the case, the defeat of a Bond Issue; unemployment will be deeply affected, therefor it would be economically sound to present the proposed financing in two periods. In the interim, Federal and State subventions are possible.

Throughout the series of meetings of this Committee, I have continuously borne in mind the fact that our purpose is to outline projects which will create employment, meanwhile being cognizant of the taxpayers' burden. My conclusions are based accordingly.

Adolph Uhl (signed)  
ADOLPH UHL.

1. The first step is to identify the problem or question that needs to be answered. This involves understanding the context and the specific requirements of the task.

*[Faint, illegible handwritten notes]*

*[Faint, illegible handwritten notes]*

1944

Mar. 2











